/237.032E56>C1>V3/

49915
England

St. Procopius College Library
Lisle, Illinois

The books in the reference section are to be used only in the library.

Books reserved for the use of certain classes are to be used in the library during class hours. By special arrangement they may be used outside the library after class hours.

All other books may be retained for two weeks and renewed once for the same period.

One cent a day is charged for each book kept overdue.

Damage to books beyond reasonable wear and all losses shall be paid for.

No books may be taken from the library without being charged.

Complete regulations may be found in the Library Handbook, which every student is urged to consult for full use of the library.

/237.032E5

WORKS OF

THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN ENGLAND

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T3-BUK-855

THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN ENGLAND

FIRST BISHOP OF CHARLESTON

Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index
under the direction of

THE MOST REVEREND SEBASTIAN G. MESSMER
Archbishop of Milwaukee

With Portraits

WITHDRAWN

VOLUME III

Cleveland, Ohio
The Arthur H. Clark Company
1908

COPYRIGHT 1908, BY

THE ARTHUR H. CLARK COMPANY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III

PART II. CONTROVERSY [CONCLUDED].

Calumnies of J. Blanco White [*concluded from Volume II*] 9

Catholic Doctrine Misrepresented 104

Controversy with Mount Zion Missionary 223

PART III. HISTORY: GENERAL.

On the Residence of St. Peter in Rome 329

The Pope's Dispensing Power 385

English Ecclesiastical Laws and Privileges 424

The Moral Character of Several Popes 452

PART II

CONTROVERSY

(Concluded from Volume II)

LETTER XLIV.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 29, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—My first object in this letter is to show you that the doctrine of Purgatory is older than Christianity, and therefore, when the Rev. Joseph Blanco White asserted that "on the cessation of penitential discipline, tradition having about the same time brought purgatory to light, offered an ample scope to the power of the Roman keys," if he meant that it was then a new doctrine, his assertion was grossly erroneous; next, I desire to show that this was the doctrine of the true believers previous to the coming of the Redeemer, and therefore, if it was then true, it must continue still to be a sound doctrine, except there exists some sufficient evidence of its having been changed by an alteration in the mode of God's proceedings towards those who are placed in judgment before him. This evidence ought to be produced by those who would make the assertion, for, until then, it is fairly supposed not to exist.

The Jewish people at present use the following, amongst other prayers, at the interment of their deceased friends:

"*At the interment of a man.*

1. "Omnipotent God of life! we pray thee have mercy over him, thou King of the universe; for with thee is the centre of life: O may he continually be led in the land of the living: And may his soul receive rest in the bundle of life.

2. "O may the Gracious, in his many mercies, forgive his sins: and may his good works be present in his sight, and may be placed in his view, together with all his faithful ones, and may he be led in his presence in the land of the living.

3. "O may he have a good memorial before his rock, that he may inherit of the riches of him who formed him, that he may approach to his light, to remain in his vision, and in the vision of his word: since my covenant of life and peace with him, therefore let his soul receive rest in the bundle of life.

4. "O mayest thou find the gates of heaven open, and mayest thou behold the city of Peace, and the dwelling place of the trusty, and may the angels of peace approach thee joyful, and the High Priest standing ready to receive thee; and mayest thou go to thy end and receive thy firm stand and rest.

5. "May thy soul go to the cave of Machpela, and thence to the cherubim where God will guide it; and there Pinkas will receive thee into the Garden of Eden, its desired path, and there wilt thou behold the pillar drawn from above, and wilt thou be highly exalted and not remain without: and mayest thou go to thy end, and receive thy firm stand and rest.

6. "Michael shall open the gates of the sanctuary and offer thy soul as an offering before God; and there will be joined with thee the redeeming angel, until the gates of the pleasant place where Israel is. In this pleasant place mayest thou merit to stand, and mayest thou go to thy end and receive thy firm stand and rest.

7. "O may thy soul be bound in the bundle of life, together with the heads of the colleges and captivity, with the Israelites, Priests and Levites, and with the seven companions of the just and perfected, and in the garden of Eden mayest thou receive thy firm stand and delight, and thou go to thy end, and wilt receive thy firm stand and rest."

In this part of the service, we find that God is besought to have mercy on the soul of a person who has been already judged; and the object of the prayer is to obtain for that soul rest in the bundle of life, that is amongst the congregated saints in the rest of life, amongst those who are not afflicted by any thing which could disturb their repose. Next God is besought to forgive sins which might be as yet against this judged man and obstacles to his entering into the land of the living amongst the faithful, or in the bundle of life: next, the petition is for his being brought to an approach to light, which presupposes existence in darkness: the petition is also to have this person go to the end, and not be stayed in the passage, and that he may receive a firm stand, and not an unstable and transitory habitation; the special places mentioned in the next passage shew the belief of such an intermediate place through which persons pass before they arrive at this firm stand and rest.

For an eminent person there is a special prayer, in which the same principle is found, as may be seen by the following extract:

"An established repose, in the celestial abode, under the wings of the divine presence, according to the degree of the holy and pure, who shine as the refulgent splendor of the firmament: a renewal of strength; expiation of trespasses; removal of transgression; and approach of sal-

vation, compassion and favor, from the presence of him who dwelleth on high: may it be granted, that in the goodly part of the future state, there may be the portion and tranquil abode of the soul of the good person named, A. B. May the spirit of God lead him into Paradise, being now departed from this world according to the will of God, the Eternal Self-Existent of heaven and earth. May the supreme King of kings, through his infinite mercy, have mercy on him, pity and compassionate him. May the supreme King of kings, through his infinite mercy hide him under the shadow of his wings, and in the sacred place of his tabernacle; to behold the beauty of the Eternal Self-Existent, and to inquire in his temple: may he raise him at the end of days: and cause him to drink of the brook of his dainties. May he cause his soul to be bound up in the bundle of life; and his rest to be glorious. May the Eternal Self-Existent be his inheritance; and grant him peace: and may his repose be in peace: as it is written, he shall come in peace: they shall rest in their beds: every one walking in his uprightness. May he, and all his people of Israel, who lay in the dust, be included in mercy and forgiveness. And may it thus be acceptable, and let us say, *Amen.*"

The whole tenor of this prayer manifests the doctrine of "expiation of trespasses," "removal of transgression," and "approach to salvation," and prayer offered by the living to obtain those blessings, together with the repose, in peace, and life for the persons who are dead.

The following, which contains the same principle, is said for women:

"O most merciful! to whom mercy appertaineth; and by whose fiat the worlds were created: both this and the future one; in which are deposited the souls of the righteous and pious women, who performed his will. May he, by his word, glory and power, command the ascension of the memorial of the worthy, modest, and virtuous woman, A. B., into his presence; may the spirit of God lead her into paradise, being now departed from this world, according to the will of God, the Lord of heaven and earth. May the Supreme King of kings, through his infinite mercy, pity and compassionate her, and grant her peace; and may her repose be in peace; as it is written, he shall come in peace: they shall rest in their beds: every one walking in his uprightness. May she and all the daughters of Israel, who sleep in the dust with her, be included in mercy and forgiveness. And may it thus be acceptable, and let us say, *Amen.*"

Whoever reads those prayers attentively must see that they are not only for the comfort of the survivors, but for the benefit of the deceased.

I shall now add a few observations, to make it more manifest, if

possible, that the doctrine upon which those prayers and other Jewish observances is founded, is similar to ours.

During the seven days subsequent to the death of any member, a number of the nation, at least ten, assemble morning and evening, with the mourning family, to pray; and on each occasion of prayer, the prayer for the dead is repeated, beseeching of God to grant repose and peace to the departed soul.

After the seven days of retirement and affliction are passed away, the days are counted to the number of thirty from the decease, which are days also of mourning, and of devotion for the family, though the regular prayer has ceased at the end of the seventh.

The son of the deceased, or one substituted for him by adoption, attends the synagogue with more than usual punctuality until the anniversary, and there is a special prayer, which he says, more indeed of acknowledgement of God's justice, than to beseech mercy for the deceased.

I shall therefore say, that the Jewish nation did not take up the custom of praying for the repose of the souls of their deceased friends from the Christians, but that they received it, together with their other customs, from their ancestors; that those ancestors had the custom long before the Christian era; and that the doctrine of the utility of such prayer, existed in the ancient Jewish Church, which was the true Church of God; and not being a portion of the ritual or political code, but a doctrine of permanent truth, revealed by heaven, was always to be retained; and thus the Christian finding it not condemned or revealed by the Saviour, but alluded to and recognised by him, as I have shown in a former letter, caused no interruption to the practice, and not only observed the day of the interment, but, the third, the seventh, the thirtieth, and the anniversary days, and therefore those are not papistical observances, but some of the most ancient and venerable and consoling and beneficial practices of true Jewish religion.

I now come to two other practices of the modern Jews, which have also been derived from their progenitors, viz. prayers made for the repose of their deceased friends in the synagogue on the day of atonement, at the request of the persons who make offerings for that purpose. On this occasion, the person who makes the offering, has it made to obtain from God a blessing on his living friends, and repose for those who are deceased, and the suffrages are made for persons who have been dead during many years, as well as for those who have died within the preceding year. Surely neither Bishop Kemp nor Blanco White, will say that it was in compliment to the Roman Catholic Church, nor

in imitation of it, the Jew introduced this custom; especially when the whole Israelitic nation will testify that it is as ancient as is any other part of their observances.

The other is a similar custom, but upon a less solemn occasion. It is usual to call upon different members of the synagogue to attend the reader during the several portions of the Pentateuch being read weekly, and on those occasions the member so called upon, frequently makes an offering, to have part of the service specially applied to the benefit of his intention and the aid of his friends whether living or dead; and very often such special application is made for persons who have been a long time deceased: the alms thus given are believed to be useful, and the service thus applied is believed to do them a benefit. This custom the nation testifies to be much older than the Christian era, and to have been derived from the best days of their pure and true Church: consequently no introduction of Popery. No person would make himself so ridiculous as to assert that it was received by the Jews from our Church.

Having thus seen the practice of the modern Jews, I shall look to that of their ancestors before the Christian era. The fact which I shall here place before you, occurred about 250 years before the birth of the Redeemer. Of course we consider the books of the Machabees to be canonical Scripture, and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, but let us for the present suppose them to be only what our opponents will admit, viz. a true history of facts. I shall quote from them the following statement:—*II Machab.* xii.

"So Judas having gathered together his army, came into the city Odollam: and when the seventh day came, they purified themselves according to the custom, and kept the Sabbath in the same place. And the day following Judas came with his company to take away the bodies of them that were slain, and to bury them with their kinsmen, in the sepulchres of their fathers. And they found under the coats of the slain some of the donaries of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbiddeth to the Jews: so that all plainly saw, that for this cause they were slain. Then they all blessed the just judgment of the Lord, who had discovered the things that were hidden.

"And so betaking themselves to prayers, they besought him, that the sin which had been committed might be forgotten. But the most valiant Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forasmuch as they saw before their eyes what had happened, because of the sins of those that were slain. And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for

the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. (For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.) And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness, had great grace laid up for them. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins."

Let us compare this record of the nation concerning a fact which occurred more than two thousand years ago, with the facts which we ourselves now observe amongst the same people; their prayers and their offerings for the dead; and let Bishop Kemp and his associates answer whether prayers and suffrages for the dead were not previous to the days of the Apostles considered as useful to obtain pardon for their lesser transgressions. Nor can it be pretended that this was a corrupt usage which had crept into the Jewish Church, because Judas Machabeus was himself not only the protecting champion of his nation and of the true religion, but also the High Priest of the regular lineage of Aaron, who only did that which he knew to have been usual and lawful. I shall dwell a little upon the import of this passage: it contains the following conclusions: first, that it was the belief of the then Jewish spiritual authority that lesser sins might be remitted after death; and since no person having any unremitted sin can enter heaven, it is a manifest corollary that the person who dies guilty of a sin which is subsequently remitted, suffers temporary exclusion from heaven, and is thus in a state of purgation until that remission takes place: secondly, that the prayers and suffrages of the living were useful to the dead who were not utterly rejected for grievous crimes which deserved the punishment of hell: thirdly, that all the penalty of sin was not remitted at the hour of death, even though the guilt might be blotted out and the punishment of hell remitted, for they still might be held in captivity for a temporary punishment, which would be substituted for the eternal, such as we find from many places in Scripture to be the usual mode of God's providential and merciful dispensation; and therefore a person might die with godliness and have great grace laid up for him, but not to be obtained until after the endurance of this temporary pain, or its remission upon intercession.

I believe it may now be safely stated that I have shown that the doctrine of the efficacy of prayer for the relief of the dead, was in the true Church of Judea, was known as such by the Saviour and his Apostles, was alluded to and admitted by them; was never reprobated, never undervalued, but as being a correct and true doctrine of heaven,

formed as much a portion of the new law as did the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and it was as unnecessary for our blessed Lord and his Apostles to make any new revelation upon the subject, as upon the subject of the existence of God himself and a future state of rewards and punishments. Hence we find it acted upon uniformly by the Jew and the Christian, save those of the latter, who, in the fourth century, adhered to Aerius, in the twelfth century to Peter De Bruis, and in the sixteenth century to Martin Luther and to John Calvin.

There was a custom amongst the Jews, which was also amongst the early Christians, as is testified amongst others by St. John Chrysostom, (Hom. xxii in *Matt.*) of inviting the poor, and the pious to a banquet upon the occasion of a death, that after having partaken of the bounty they might pray for the repose of the soul of the deceased: and in some places, the food was after the interment placed upon the grave, that the person who there found relief for his body, might pray for the relief of the soul of the individual for whose sake the benefaction was given. In many places we may yet observe much of the remains of those customs. But as we are not by our adversaries allowed to quote the book of Tobias as canonical, I shall adduce from it historical evidence of the custom which I have described.

In the advice which that holy man gives to his son as recorded in chap. iv. is the following passage:—verses 17, 18,

"Eat thy bread with the hungry and the needy; and with thy garments cover the naked. Lay out thy bread and thy wine upon the burial of a just man; and do not eat and drink thereof with the wicked."

In the *II Kings*, otherwise *II Samuel*—chapter xii, verse 16, and so forth, we distinctly find the objects of the fasting of King David.

"And David besought the Lord for the child: and David kept a fast, and going in by himself lay upon the ground. And the ancients of his house came to make him rise from the ground; but he would not: neither did he eat meat with them. And it came to pass on the seventh day that the child died: and the servants of David feared to tell him that the child was dead. For they said; Behold, when the child was yet alive, we spoke to him, and he would not hearken to our voice; how much more will he afflict himself, if we tell him that the child is dead? But when David saw his servants whispering, he understood that the child was dead: and he said to his servants: Is the child dead? They answered him: He is dead. Then David arose from the ground, and washed, and anointed himself: and when he had changed his apparel, he went into the house of the Lord, and worshiped: and then he came

into his own house, and he called for bread, and ate. And his servants said to him: What thing is this that thou hast done? thou didst fast and weep for the child, while it was alive: but when the child was dead, thou didst rise up, and eat bread. And he said: While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept for him: for I said: Who knoweth whether the Lord may not give him to me, and the child may live. But now that he is dead, why should I fast; shall I be able to bring him back any more? I shall go to him rather: but he shall not return to me."

The King then did not fast through grief or affliction of regret, but by way of prayer, and for the purpose of impetration or obtaining favor: and his answer shows his estimate of the folly of fasting through grief or regret. Upon this principle the venerable Bede very properly explains other passages of the same divine records in conformity to what the whole of the preceding testimony assures us is their meaning. Thus in chap. iii of the same book, upon the occasion of the death of Abner; after David lamented and mourned for his death, he fasted to entreat mercy from God, for his soul: so too in the xxxi chapter of the preceding book, the brave men who buried Saul and Jonathan, fasted seven days, not in idle grief, but in profitable intercession for their souls—and in chap. ii of book ii, it is recorded that David expressed his gratitude to those good men for their corporal and spiritual mercy to Saul.

Another custom of patriarchal times was founded upon the doctrine which I am at present exhibiting, for that doctrine was known in those days and gave to the venerable fathers of the faithful in ancient times equal consolation, as it did to the Christian of after ages, and as it does to the Catholic of to-day. There is a marked difference between Catholics and Protestants upon the subject of interments. The former always desire to be buried near their Church, or at least in the place common to the members of their communion. They are often said to be superstitiously fond of what is too often sneered at, consecrated ground. Whilst persons of other denominations are generally above this vulgar prejudice, and think their bodies just as well provided for in a corner of their plantation, or field, or any other place; the Catholic expects to have his soul benefited by the prayers offered on its behalf by those who seeing the spot where the body is buried, intercede for him: hence the origin of cemeteries about the Churches: the Catholic believes that when the Church solemnly prays for the repose of the souls of those persons whose bodies might be interred within the inclosure, he will be made partaker of the benefit of the prayer when his body is so in-

terred: hence we value highly interment in ground so consecrated; strangers to our Church may, if they will, call this superstition; but it is one of a very ancient date. We find such superstition in Jacob as we read in *Genesis*, xlvii, verse 29, and so forth.

"And when he saw that the day of his death drew nigh, he called his son Joseph, and said to him: if I have found favor in thy sight, put thy hand under my thigh and thou shalt show me this kindness and truth, not to bury me in Egypt: But I will sleep with my fathers, and thou shalt take me away out of this land, and bury me in the burying place of my ancestors. And Joseph answered him: I will do what thou hast commanded. And he said: Swear then to me. And as he was swearing, Israel adored God, turning to the bed's head."

Also in chapter 1, regarding Joseph, it is written, verse 23, and so forth.

"After which he told his brethren: God will visit you after my death, and will make you go up out of this land, to the land which he swore to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And he made them swear to him, saying: God will visit you, carry my bones with you out of this place: And he died, being a hundred and ten years old. And being embalmed, he was laid in a coffin in Egypt."

The testimony of the whole body of interpreters, as well as of other witnesses, has been uniformly given to inform us that the great object of the patriarchs was to have their bodies brought amongst their kindred to have the benefit of commemoration and participation in their sacrifices and suffrages, even after their death.

To these proofs I might add passages from the sacred writers of the old law, which the earliest Christians testified to have been always understood of purgatory. Thus *Psalm* xxxvii, (Prot. ver. xxxviii,)

"Rebuke me not, O Lord, in thy indignation, nor chastise me in thy wrath."

St. Augustine, Bede, and many others tell us that it means, "Do not, O Lord, punish me after death by the passing rebuke even of your (lighter) indignation: nor by the (heavier) wrath which endures for ever."

Origen, St. Ambrose and others, in like manner find the testimony of the doctrine in *Psalm* lxv, (Prot. ver. lxvi, 12,)

"We have passed through fire and water and thou hast brought us out into a refreshment."

Where the water is baptism, and the fire purgatory.

St. Augustine in his book xx *Of the City of God*, chapter 25, informs

us that the prophet Isaias speaks of purgatory in the spiritual meaning of verse 4, chapter iv.

"If the Lord shall wash away the filth of the daughters of Sion, and shall wash away the blood of Jerusalem out of the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning."

St. Basil informs us that the doctrine was also exhibited by the same prophet, in his chapter ix—in the spiritual meaning of verse 18. St. John states that the doctrine was found also according to many persons in the spiritual meaning of Micheas, chapter vii, 8, 9.

"Rejoice not, thou my enemy, over me, because I am fallen: I shall arise, when I sit in darkness, the Lord is my light. I will bear the wrath of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, until he judge my cause, and execute judgment for me: he will bring me forth into the light, I shall behold his justice."

St. Augustine and several other fathers explain the passage of the prophet Zacharias, chapter ix, verse 11, of the release of souls from purgatory by the merits of the shedding of the blood of the New Testament, as well as the release of the fathers from limbo by the same blood.

"Thou also by the blood of thy testament hast sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit, wherein is no water."

I believe the doctrine to have been taught in those several passages: but my argument does not rest upon the correctness of that assertion. I will suppose all those interpreters to have erred in their comments. This conclusion must still be unshaken. Those earliest lights of Christianity knew and taught that it was a doctrine of the pure Jewish Church, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful; in this there could not have been a mistake on their parts: add this to my other documents, and it is manifest that this was a doctrine of true religion before the epoch of Christianity.

I remain, yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XLV.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 5, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Since writing my last letter, I have with feelings of pain and sorrow read the account of Bishop Kemp's unexpected and melancholy death. I deeply regret that my last letter contains a call upon him, and that call written at a time when he had paid the debt of nature, though I did not and could not have known it when I wrote.

I regret it, because should any of his friends read that call after the interment of a respected and lamented friend, the feeling which it must create, will be to them unpleasant, and such as I would not desire to produce. I trust they will accept this explanation.

With the deceased prelate I had never the honor of an acquaintance, to him I bore no feeling of unkindness, I sympathize with his afflicted relatives; but from his own act he made it necessary for me in the course of my previous letters to address many of my observations to him, as the leader of an host by which my Church was, as I conceive, without foundation or necessity assailed, by the recommendation of White's libelous production, as an accurate portrait of Catholicism, to the perusal of the Protestants of America. I am bound in charity to believe that Bishop Kemp in doing what deeply wounded a large and respectable portion of his fellow-citizens, acted according to his knowledge and conviction, and sense of duty. And when I an humble individual knew that knowledge to be delusion, that conviction to be unfounded, and that sense of duty to be erroneous; I did appeal to him for the correction of my statements, if in his power, the subversion of my principles, if they were not tenable, and the disproving of my conclusions, if they could be destroyed. I did so with freedom, and I hope without disrespect; I did so plainly, because the position which he had volunteered to occupy was that of a direct and open assailant of the line in which I am marshalled, and upon a post which I feel bound to defend. But although in the haste of furnishing these generally unrevised and uncorrected letters for publication, many expressions have escaped me, which I would upon a review suppress, and some of those be more harsh than I should desire to use, still I trust that at no moment has there been in my heart one movement towards this lamented individual which was inconsistent with kind and charitable feeling. He has passed away; called before a just and merciful God; who I should hope regarded him with that compassion which each of us would desire for himself; of course his name shall no more appear in these letters. Dr. Wilmer too, whose signature first stood at the head of the list is no more; I shall therefore in any appeal which I might feel it proper henceforth to make, address the survivors as a body, rather than select an individual as their representative. I felt it, if not required, to be at least a relief to myself to make this explanation, and shall now resume my task.

I have shown that the doctrines of the existence of Purgatory and of the power of the living to aid the souls therein detained by their suffrages, were held by the true Church of the Jews. I proceed now to show that the existence of Purgatory was held by the Gentiles, and

was one of the original doctrines of revelation. Previous to my entering upon this proof, I feel it necessary to lay down a few principles and to explain and exemplify them by facts.

My first principle is that since a true revealed religion existed before the art of writing was invented, revealed doctrines and their sufficient evidence might exist without having been committed to writing, and therefore we are not to reject a doctrine as not revealed upon the mere plea that it is not found testified in a written record. It is evident that previous to the days of Moses there were a variety of doctrines revealed by heaven, and believed by religious men; amongst others that of the immortality of the soul, and of a future state of rewards and punishments: Noe and his sons believed those doctrines, so did Abraham, so did Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and hundreds of others who never saw a book of Scripture.

I will next observe that those doctrines did not cease to be true, and revealed articles of faith, because at a subsequent period other truths were revealed and written, though these earlier articles should not have been written. I look upon this proposition to be so plain as to need no argument for its proof, because surely the truth of a fact or of a doctrine cannot depend upon the mere circumstance of its being written, otherwise none of the doctrines of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ would have been true until from seven to ten years after his death, when St. Matthew wrote his Gospel; and several others would not have been true for about fifty years more, as there are several in the Gospel of St. John which had not been previously committed to writing. The finding of a doctrine written upon a proper and sufficient record is good evidence of its truth, but it is not the only sort of good evidence, otherwise the doctrines of Christ were preached by the Apostles without good evidence, and the revealed doctrines which were believed before the days of Moses were received by the faithful of that day without good evidence; whereas we know distinctly that those men who never saw a book of the Scriptures had sound faith and believed the revelation of God upon sufficient evidence, both previous to the time of Moses and from the death of Christ to the writing of the Gospels.

I will also state that it was not from the Pentateuch the Jewish people derived the knowledge of the immortality of the soul and of the rewards and punishments of a future state, and of a variety of the other essential and fundamental doctrines of religion, which had been revealed ages before the days of Moses, and believed by the people of Israel before his birth. He who would seek to find all those in the Pentateuch would return disappointed, for they had been revealed and

believed before it was written, and therefore were doctrines of early faith, and several of them were not written in that book, but did not cease therefore to be true, and to be a portion of revelation: but they were preserved in evidence, though not on the book, yet in the same manner that the evidence was preserved that the contents of the book were originally true and had been preserved unchanged.

I again assert that the great features of revealed religion, as it existed previous to the dispersion of Babel are to be found in all the various systems of Paganism to the coming of Christ. The Patriarchal race and others who were true and pure worshippers of God preserved them unaltered; the heathens only disfigured the doctrines, corrupted the practice of morality, and misapplied the ceremonial of worship, to which also they added much superstition. What I mean by the great features of revealed religion, are the existence of a Supreme Providential Being who ought to receive our homage, and who views our conduct, and will in a future state reward or punish us according to our desserts. The Heathen multiplied deities, and worshipped devils and not God: he assimilated the punishments of that future state and its rewards to what he found painful or pleasing here below: his principle that God ought to be worshiped by sacrifice, and so forth, was correct; but in applying the principle he erred. As regarded offences, they did not blend all transgressors into one heap for promiscuous damnation, but they made a classification of crimes, and of criminals, and according to this distinction, they as well as the Jew believed that there was to be eternal punishment for great delinquents, and only a temporary purgation for others. We find this distinction held by the Gentile world as far up as we can trace any satisfactory evidence upon the subject. I shall if required state many particulars of that evidence: at present, I merely exhibit the principle of the argument, and from a book lying before me I refer for the Greeks to Plato, *in Phaedo*, and *Gorgias*, where he gives the description of those who having lived in piety and justice, are immediately after death transported to the islands of the blessed; of those who having committed expiable offences are held in punishment until the guilt is cleared away; and of those whose crimes are incurable and who are cast into Tartarus to be punished for ever, but whose affliction profits nothing to themselves; but they are examples to others: and for the Romans to Cicero, *Som. Scipionis*, in fine, where he mentions a place of purgation. Claudian too gives us Purgatory.

Quos ubi per varios amnes per mille figuras,
Egit Lethaeo purgatos flumine.

In Ruffin. Book ii, v. 491.

In the sixth book of the Aeneid[37] we have very fine descriptions by Virgil of the three states, and corresponding pretty accurately with the doctrine of Plato. I shall merely give a short passage respecting each.

HELL.

"Dux inclyte Teucrum,
Nulli fas casto sceleratum insistere limen;
Sed me, cum lucis Hecate praefecit Avernis,
Ipsa Deum poenas docuit, perque omnia duxit.
Gnossius haec Rhadamanthus habet durissima regna,
Castigatque, auditque dolos: subigitque fateri
Quae quis apud superos, furto laetatus inani,
Distulit in seram commisso piacula mortem.
Continuo sontes ultrix accinta flagello
Tisiphone quatit insultans: torvosque sinistra
Intentans angues, vocat agmina saeva sororum.
. . . . . .
Ne quaere doceri
Quam poenam; aut quae forma viros fortunave mersit.
Saxum ingens volvunt alii, radiisve rotarum
Districti pendent; sedet, aeternumque sedebit
Infelix Theseus; Phlegyasque miserrimus omnes
Admonet, et magna testatur voce per umbras:
'Discite justitiam moniti, et non temnere Divos.'"

DRYDEN'S *Translation.*

The chaste, the holy race
Are all forbidden this polluted place,
But Hecate, when she gave to rule the woods,
Then led me trembling through the dire abodes,
And taught the tortures of the avenging Gods.
These are the realms of unrelenting fate;
And awful Rhadamanthus rules the State:
He hears and judges each committed crime;
Inquires into the manner, place, and time.
The conscious wretch must all his acts reveal:
Loth to confess, unable to conceal:
From the first moment of his vital breath,
To his last hour of unrepenting death.
Straight, o'er the guilty ghost, the fury shakes
The sounding whip, and brandishes her snakes;
And the pale sinner with her sisters takes.
. . . . . .

PITT'S *Translation.*

But what their torments, seek not thou to know,
Or the dire sentence of their endless woe.

[37] See an Essay on this Book, in Part V.

Some roll a stone, rebounding down the hill,
Some hang suspended on the whirling wheel;
There Theseus groans in pains that ne'er expire,
Chained down for ever in a chair of fire;
There Phlegyas feels unutterable woe,
And roars incessant through the shades below:
Be just; ye mortals! by these torments awed,
These dreadful torments, not to scorn a God.

HEAVEN.

His demum exactis perfecto munere divae,
Devenere locos laetos, et amoena vireta
Fortunatorum nemorum, sedesque beatas.
Largior hic campos aether et lumine vestit
Purpuroe; Solemque suum, sua sidera norunt.
. . . . . .
Hic manus, ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi,
Quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat,
Quique pii vates, et Phoebo digna locuti,
Inventas ant qui vitam excoluere per artes,
Quique sui memores alios fecere merendo:
Omnibus his nivea cinguntur tempora vitta.

PITT'S *Translation.*

These rites complete, they reach the flowery plains,
The verdant groves where endless pleasure reigns.
Here growing ether shoots a purple ray,
And o'er the region pours a double day,
From sky to sky the unwearied splendor runs,
And nobler planets roll round brighter suns.
. . . . . .

DRYDEN'S *Translation.*

Here patriots live, who for their country's good,
In fighting fields were prodigal of blood;
Priests of umblemish'd lives here made abode,
And poets worthy their inspiring God:
And searching wits, of more mechanic parts,
Who grac'd their age with new invented arts,
Those who to worth their bounty did extend;
And those who knew that bounty to commend.
The heads of these with holy fillets bound
And all their temples were with garlands crown'd.

PURGATORY.

Igneus est illis vigor et coelestis origo
Quantum non noxia corpora tardant,
Terrenique hebetant artus, moribundaque membra.
Hinc metuunt cupiuntque; dolent gaudentque; neque auras
Dispiciunt, clausae tenebris et carcere caeco.
Quin et supremo cum lumine vita reliquit:

Non tamen omne malum miseris, nec funditus omnes
Corporeae excedunt pestes; penitusque necesse est
Multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris.
Ergo exercentur poenis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt. Aliae panduntur inanes
Suspensae ad ventos: aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni.
Quisque suos patimur manes. Exinde per amplum
Mittimur Elysium, et pauci laeta arva tenemus:
Donec longa dies perfecto temporis orbe
Concretam exemit labem purumque reliquit
Aethereum sensum, atque aurai simplicis ignem.

PITT'S *Translation.*

Their souls at first from high Olympus came;
And, if not blunted by the mortal frame,
Th' ethereal fires would ever burn the same!
But while on Earth; by Earth-born passions tost,
The heavenly spirits lie extinct and lost;
Nor steal one glance before their bodies die,
From those dark dungeons to their native sky.
Ev'n when those bodies are to death resign'd,
Some old inherent spots are left behind;
A sullying tincture of corporeal stains
Deep in the substance of the soul remains.
Thus are her splendors dimm'd, and crusted o'er
With those dark vices, that she knew before.
For this the souls a various penance pay,
To purge the taint of former crimes away:
Some in the sweeping breezes are refin'd,
And hung on high to whiten in the wind;
Some cleanse their stains beneath the gushing streams,
And some rise glorious from the searching flames.
Thus all must suffer; and, those sufferings past,
The clouded minds are purified at last.
But when the circling seasons, as they roll,
Have cleans'd the dross long gather'd round the soul;
When the celestial fire divinely bright,
Breaks forth victorious in her native light:
Then we, the chosen few, Elysium gain,
And here expatiate on the blissful plain.

My argument from the facts now exhibited is very simple. Blanco White and his abettors would insinuate that the doctrine of Purgatory was not known for several centuries after the establishment of Christianity: and thus lay the foundation for asserting that it was an invention of what they call Popery. I have met it by producing the early Fathers of the Church to show that it was one of the ancient and original doctrines of the Christian body: I have produced the ancient liturgies;

I have produced the ancient separatists; I have thus shown that it was a tenet of the early Church, and not an invention of a later period. I went farther when I showed that it was a doctrine of the Jewish Church previous to the arrival of the Saviour, and I now show that it was a doctrine of Plato, of Cicero, of Virgil, and of other Greeks and Romans before the same epoch. Suppose the tenet to be as gross an error as the worship of the leeks of Egypt. I have at all events proved that it was no invention of the Popes or of their adherents. And yet those persons who claim to be more learned than we are, and who affect to pity us for the overshadowing of our intellect; those good gentlemen who bellow against our religion in the cities, and the towns, and the villages, and the courts, and the woods of this continent, most wise and learned antiquarians, most erudite and critical historians as they are, perpetually tell their hearers that the doctrine of Purgatory is one of the inventions of Popery. I have known clergymen in this city of Charleston, who really have, I believe, good claims to be considered scholars, recommend this same work of Blanco White to their friends and congregations, as being amongst other things a very accurate and good description of the origin of Roman Catholic errors: now what must be our opinion of the information of those gentlemen, upon their own professional subjects, if, as we are in charity bound to suppose, they believe what they stated?

Before I leave this topic, I shall show you what I conceive to be abundant reason to lead to the conclusion that the Gentile as well as the Jew derived the knowledge of the doctrine from those to whom it was revealed by God in the earliest ages of the world.

I remain, yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XLVI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 12, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—We have seen that before the days of our Saviour, the doctrine of the existence of Purgatory was a tenet of the true Jewish Church, and of some of the most enlightened Gentiles. A question presents itself to us, "Were they in error on this subject?" Though it is not exactly within the range of my task, I shall meet this question by stating, that they were not in error. In my last letter, I laid down a few principles which I request you still to bear in mind, and at the proper period apply to what I shall now adduce: we shall thus obtain the rule for ascertaining what is error and what is truth in those early doctrines.

I assume the single origin of the human family; I assume that God made revelations to Adam, which were the foundation of the correct religious practices, and the substance of the faith of the true believers; I assume an object of the Almighty to be, that the preservation of the knowledge thus communicated by him to Adam, was to be one of the first and most important religious obligations of mankind; I assume that neither Adam nor any of his descendants was acquainted with the future state of mortals, by any power of natural reasoning. In fact, we know nothing of a future state, save what we have learned from revelation; nor could we, nor could our earliest predecessors know with certainty that there was such a state, nor any of its circumstances, by the light of our natural reason: hence, every thing which was so known, had been revealed by him who knew what he saw and declared. After the deluge, Noah and his family had a knowledge of those revelations, one of the most important of which regarded the testimony of man: it was the most simple, the most interesting, the most easily recollected, and that which would most naturally arrest frequently and powerfully the attention of every person.

If men had been originally told that there were but two states, one of eternal happiness, and one of eternal misery, they would scarcely think of imagining a third state of transient endurance and ultimate happiness against the plain, positive, and universal testimony; or if several did, there would be some at least found who would have rejected the novelty, and adhered to the ancient evidence. Let us even abandon this ground, and say that they all erred, and that in their delusion, they framed a notion of such a Purgatory: still we must be certain, that when God gave a new revelation, he would have corrected this error, and the people to whom such revelation had been given would be rescued from the delusion: we would then find truth amongst the newly-instructed people, and error amongst the others. The patriarchs received a revelation; and its evidences were continued to their descendants, the Israelites, who had their knowledge extended by still more ample communications; and yet we find a perfect coincidence in the substantial belief, as to the number and nature of the states in another world, between the Israelites and the Gentiles. Thus we arrive at the conclusion, that the doctrine so found to exist was that which was originally given, and therefore the early revelation of God testified the existence of Heaven, of Hell, and of Purgatory.

Let us take another supposition, that it was a doctrine which the Gentiles did not receive from the original traditions derived from Adam and Noe, but that Plato who is supposed to have derived much of his

knowledge from the sacred writings and from the Jews, drew his theory from this people, and that from this philosopher it spread through the Gentiles; in this case, we should have to attribute its origin to the Jews, who were the chosen people of God; and shall we say that a nation selected by the peculiar providence of heaven, in the midst of revelation and of miracles, to preserve the great truths of pure religion, taught error even to the philosophers of Greece? But the difficulty becomes greater, when we survey other and earlier nations, to whom Plato could not have taught what he had learned from the Mosaic code, or from the Hebrew people; thus the circumstance of its being found in those other nations, destroys the foundation sought to be laid, and we are driven to that inevitable conclusion, that it was one of the earliest religious doctrines of the world.

We next come to review facts, and they are all easily explained, by admitting what we state as their foundation. Several nations held the doctrine of the metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls. Let us, for a moment, view the foundation of truth and the superstructure of error. The ancient tenets gave a knowledge of Heaven, of Hell, and of a state of Purgation; but it was easily imagined by some that this purgation consisted in transmigration, in order that the sins and imperfections of one life might be punished by endurance in another: thus the very superadded error bore testimony to the original truth. Prayer was from the earliest ages offered for the dead, by those who held the doctrines of pure and undefiled religion, and those prayers and obsequies were special accompaniments of the funeral: here also the tenet was preserved, that the troubled spirit was brought to repose by the due obsequies and the proper prayer, although the Gentile preserved only an indistinct idea, and used a superstitious rite of obsequy. The Jew did not take from the Gentile, nor the Gentile from the Jew, but both followed the custom, as they preserved the principle of their common ancestor, to whom God had made the revelation. I before remarked, that the errors and superstitions of Paganism were but a corruption of the primitive truths taught by God to man; and I have in this case given an exhibition hastily and imperfectly, it is true, but with sufficient distinctness to show that Purgatory and the efficacy of prayer for the dead, were some of the original doctrines of the earliest revelation, long before the days of Moses; previous, I would say, to the deluge, and derived from the days of Adam, of Seth, and of Enos, which were centuries upon centuries before the time insinuated and suggested by Blanco White and the erudite antiquarians who recommended his book to the Protestants of America.

I have done with the proofs of the doctrine; and, although I have been tedious and desultory, I have by no means exhausted my store of facts or topics of argument. I have neither the leisure nor the opportunity for arranging my arguments or correcting my style. A variety of heavy cares and perplexing duties, together with the want of a sufficient library, are difficulties which must necessarily cause these crude letters to be only the collection of some materials, from which a bulwark for our faith might be constructed. The imperfections of my mode will not therefore, I trust, be injurious to the excellence of my cause; yet, even with these disadvantages, I believe it has been made plain, that the proposition of White is one of the most unfounded assertions that has ever been put forward by a man pretending to any knowledge of theology or of history. I shall therefore conclude this letter and this subject by showing that, amongst Protestants themselves, we are by no means without supporters of our tenets regarding Purgatory and prayers for the dead.

But as I have been so far back as the antediluvian age, I shall not be blamed, if, in my rapid descent, I stop to remark that in the Koran, which was chiefly compiled from an observation of Jewish and Christian customs, the doctrine of Purgatory is taught. Thus this doctrine was a portion of the true faith of the ancient line of patriarchs, of the Jewish Church, and of the Christian Church; was received amongst the Gentiles but disfigured, and its nature mistaken; was also retained by the Mahometans, and is found amongst several of the Pagan nations of the present day, to whom it has come as a portion of the primitive religion which God gave to our great progenitors; but the Pagan having derived his knowledge of heaven and of hell from the same source, exhibits to us in his profession of the belief of each state a degree of vague and chaotic knowledge in which, though the great substantial truth is preserved, there exists much of error; so it is in his belief concerning Purgatory; he testifies to the fact of its existence, but he errs in the circumstances which regard it.

Its existence was first denied in the fourth century, by Aorius and his few adherents; their sect was speedily extinct. In the twelfth century, the Waldenses and others, especially the Petrobrussians and the Albigenses, renewed the denial.

Luther, in his disputation at Leipsic, stated that he "firmly believed, nay, he would dare to say, that he knew there was a Purgatory, and was easily persuaded that mention thereof was made in the Scriptures." He next stated, that no mention was found of Purgatory in the Scriptures; next, that the souls therein were not certain of being saved; that

they could merit and sin; and lastly, he denied it for the purpose of denying other doctrines connected therewith.

The Lutherans drew up, and presented their *Confession of Faith* to the Emperor Charles V, at Augsburg, in June, 1530, and the same having been answered by some Catholic divines, Melancthon wrote its apology or defence, in the name and by the appointment of the principal Lutherans. In the apology is the following passage:

"Touching what is objected against us, concerning oblation for the dead, having been practised by the Fathers; we own they prayed for the dead, and we hinder none from now doing it; but we do not approve of the application of the Lord's Supper for the dead, in virtue of the action, *ex opere operato.*

"Unjustly do our adversaries bring against us the condemnation of Aerius, who they say was condemned for denying that the Mass was offered up for the living and the dead. This is their custom, to adduce the ancient heretics against us, and to compare our doctrine with theirs. St. Epiphanius testifies that Aerius taught that prayers for the dead were unprofitable. We do not uphold Aerius, but we contend against you for your doctrine of the Mass," and so forth.

In this it is plain that the Lutheran apologists for the *Confession of Augsburg* did not rank praying for the dead amongst Popish errors, nor agree with the heresy of Aerius, whose heresy consisted in denying the utility of those prayers.

Amongst the decisions made by King Henry VIII, as head of the English Church, and subscribed to by Thomas Cranmer, as Archbishop of Canterbury, whose signature followed that of Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General, was a full approbation of the custom of praying for the dead, "as consistent with the due order of charity to pray for them, and to make others pray for them in exequies and masses, to give alms for that end," and so forth. This subscription was made in 1536. Two years after, the English Church subscribed another document approving of prayers for the dead.

In 1557, a confession of faith drawn up by Calvin was carried to Worms, by Beza and Farel, and presented to the princes and states of the *Augsburg Confession* there assembled: in which the Calvinists of France subscribe to all the doctrines of that confession, save that of the Eucharist, and amongst them of that praying for the dead.

Grotius, a Protestant, distinctly shows from evident principles that it is confessed by Mestresat, by Spanheim, and by Calvin, that there must be purification of the soul after death; for he shows that they avow that no soul is pure at any moment of life, nor at the time of death;

that nothing polluted can enter into the kingdom of heaven, and that as Spanheim says, the soul cannot be presented to God till it be without spot or wrinkle, all holy, pure, and unblamable; and upon the question whether this purification takes place, if I may so say, during the moment of death, or at a subsequent period, Spanheim says we cannot be certain. The Catholic has learned from the testimony of God, given by ages and by nations, exhibiting his early revelations, that it frequently is deferred, and that the soul undergoes punishment, which may be alleviated by prayers and suffrages of the faithful; and hence they pray for the repose of their deceased brethren.

I shall here transcribe evidence from Bishop Milner's excellent work, *The End of Controversy,* Letter xliii, 3.

"I should do an injury, Rev. Sir, to my cause, were I to pass over the concessions of eminent Protestant prelates, and other writers, on the matter in debate. On some occasions, Luther admits of Purgatory, as an article founded on Scripture.[38] Melancthon confesses that the ancients prayed for the dead; and says, that the Lutherans do not find fault with it.[39] Calvin intimates that the souls of all the just are detained in Abraham's bosom till the day of judgment.[40] In the first Liturgy of the Church of England, which was drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, and declared by act of Parliament to have been framed by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, there is an express prayer for the departed, that 'God would grant them mercy and everlasting peace.'[41] It can be shown, that the following Bishops of your Church believe that the dead ought to be prayed for: Andrews, Usher, Montague, Taylor, Forbes, Sheldon, Barrow of St. Asaph's, and Blandford.[42] To these I may add the religious Dr. Johnson, whose published meditations prove that he constantly prayed for his deceased wife. But what need is there of more words on the subject, when it is clear that modern Protestants in shutting up the Catholic Purgatory for imperfect just souls, have opened another general one for them, and all the wicked of every sort whatsoever! It is well known that the disciples of Calvin, at Geneva, and, perhaps, every where else, instead of adhering to his doctrine, in condemning mortals to eternal torments, without any fault on their part, now hold that the most confirmed in guilt, and the finally impen-

[38] *Assertions,* art. 37. *Disput.* Leipsic.
[39] *Apolog. Conf.* Aug.
[40] *Instit.* l. iii, c. 5.
[41] See the form in Collier's *Ecc. Hist.,* vol. ii, p. 257.
[42] Collier's *Hist.*—N. B. The present Bishop of Exeter, in a sermon just published, prays for the soul of our poor Princess Charlotte, 'as far as this is lawful and profitable.'

itent shall, in the end, be saved:[43] thus establishing, as Fletcher of Madeley observes, 'General Purgatory.'[44] A late celebrated theological, as well as philosophical writer of our own country, Dr. Priestly, being on his death-bed, called for Simpson's work *On the Duration of Future Punishment*, which he recommended in these terms: 'It contains my sentiments: we shall all meet finally: we only require different degrees of discipline, suited to our different tempers, to prepare us for final happiness.[45] Here again is a general Protestant Purgatory: and why should Satan and his crew be denied the benefit of it? But to confine myself to eminent divines of the Established Church; one of its celebrated preachers, who, of course, 'never mentions hell to ears polite,' expresses his wish, 'to banish the subject of everlasting punishment from all pulpits, as containing a doctrine, at once improper and uncertain;'[46] which sentiment is applauded by another eminent divine, who reviews that sermon in the British Critic.[47] Another modern divine censures 'the threat of eternal perdition, as a cause of infidelity.'[48] The renowned Dr. Paley (but here we are getting into quite novel systems of theology, which will force a smile from its old students, notwithstanding the awfulness of the subject) Dr. Paley, I say, so far softens the punishment of the infernal regions, as to suppose that 'there may be very little to choose between the condition of some who are in hell, and others who are in heaven!'[49] In the same liberal spirit, the Cambridge Professor of Divinity teaches, that 'God's wrath and damnation are more terrible in the sound than the sense![50] and that being damned does not imply any fixed degree of evil.'[51] In another part of his lectures, he expresses his hope, and quotes Dr. Hartley as expressing the same, that 'all men will be ultimately happy, when punishment has done its work in reforming principles and conduct.'[52] If this sentiment be not sufficiently explicit in favor of Purgatory, take the following from a passage in which he is directly lecturing on the subject: 'With regard to the doctrine of Purgatory, though it may not be founded either in reason or in Scripture, it is not unnatural. Who can bear the thought of

[43] *Encycl.* Art. Geneva.
[44] *Checks to Antiom*, vol. iv.
[45] See *Edinb. Review*, Oct., 1806.
[46] *Sermons* by the Rev. W. Gilpin, Preb. of Sarum.
[47] *British Critic*, Jan., 1802.
[48] Rev. Mr. Polwhele's *Let. to Dr. Hawker.*
[49] *Moral and Polit. Philos.*
[50] *Lect.*, vol. iii, p. 154
[51] *Ibid.*
[52] Vol. ii, p. 390. It is to be observed, that the doctrine of the final salvation of the wicked is expressly condemned in the 42d Article of the Church of England, A. D., 1552.

dwelling in everlasting torments? Yet who can say that a God everlastingly just, will not inflict them? The mind of man seeks for resource; it finds only, in conceiving that some temporary punishment, after death, may purify the soul from its moral pollutions, and make it, at last, acceptable even to a Diety, infinitely pure.' "[53]

The following is an extract from the declaration of the wife of James II, who became a Catholic, when she was Duchess of York, and is dated St. James's, August 20, 1670:

"After this, I spoke severally to two of the best bishops we have in England,[54] who both told me, there were many things in the Roman Church, which it were very much to be wished we had kept: as confession, which was no doubt commanded by God. That praying for the dead was one of the ancientest things in Christianity; that, for their parts, they did it daily, though they would not own it; and afterwards, pressing one of them very much upon the other points, he told me, that if he had been bred a Catholic, he would not change his religion; but that being of another Church, wherein he was sure were all things necessary for salvation, he thought it very ill to give that scandal, as to leave that Church wherein he had received his baptism."

In this letter I have closed my evidence, and shall make a few comments upon the subject in my next.[55]

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XLVII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 19, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I now proceed to sum up in a general view the arguments upon which we found the doctrine of the existence of Purgatory and the utility of prayers for the souls therein detained.

It is conceded by our opponents that it was the prevailing belief of all Christendom in the tenth century. If it had not been derived from the Saviour and his Apostles, it must have been introduced into the Christian Church at some intermediate time: the Christians of that age stated that they did receive the doctrines from the founders of their religion. We have the *prima facie* evidence on our side: to des-

[53] Vol. iv, p. 112.

[54] *Sheldon* of Canterbury and *Blandford* of Worcester.

[55] The extent to which the doctrine of prayers for the dead has been revived in the Protestant Episcopal Churches of Britain and the United States, within the last few years, is well known to all.

troy which our opponents must show when and by whom our doctrine was invented, if it was an invention: this they have never seriously attempted: therefore upon this single ground we would claim as proved that it was a part of the original deposit of the Apostolic faith. I say they have never attempted to show when and by whom the doctrine was invented, because although they might put forth vague assertions which refer to one or more centuries, every unbiassed mind will perceive that this is no evidence.

It has sometimes been said, that innovations make their way gradually and imperceptibly. I shall show that such could not have been the case in this instance; for, if at present the belief or disbelief of this tenet is considered important amongst Christians, we may fairly assume that it was always so considered: and if now the difference of belief upon this subject is a cause of separation and of contention, such difference would have been so at all times; and my assumption is supported by three facts. When the innovators of the sixteenth century denied the truth of our doctrine, it caused general and violent commotion, and the authors of the change can now be clearly pointed out, their history told, and all the circumstances accompanying the division which ensued are matters of history: so it happened when the Petrobrussians in the twelfth century denied the truth of our doctrine: so also when Aerius in the fourth age denied the utility of prayer for the dead: in each of those cases the name and residence of the innovator can be given, and the precise period of his innovation. If our doctrine be an innovation, why are not its authors known, why is not the date of their existence pointed out?

When changes take place in doctrine the novelty is not at once adopted by an entire church, nor by a whole nation: and even let us suppose that it should take place gradually and insensibly in one church or nation, it could not be at once and noiselessly introduced into all the churches and all the nations of Christendom. We should then find nation and church opposed to nation and church, and yet our opponents do not exhibit one particle of testimony to show that such was the case, whilst they require of us to believe without evidence that they from whom the doctrine was received were innovators: and they are pleased to call us foolish and besotted and priest-ridden, for not acting against the very first principles of sound reason.

We have seen that the doctrine was taught by the Koran which was compiled in the seventh century, chiefly from the writings of the Jews and the Christians, and therefore it could not be a subsequent innovation of the Greeks, who separated from us in the ninth century; nor

of the Iconoclasts, who separated from us in the eighth century; nor was it an innovation of the Mahometans, for the Eutychians taught it in the fifth century: and the historians taught it in the fifth century: nor was it an innovation by any of those, for the Christian Church condemned Aerius for denying it in the fourth century: neither was it a novelty in that age, for Tertullian states it to be a Christian doctrine in the third century: and in this age it was received and taught by those who in the second century were the disciples of those who had been the companions of the intimate friends of the Apostles: wherefore the writers of those early ages, as we have seen, declare that it came to them from this sacred source. Nor are we to rest here; we moreover have found that it was a doctrine of the pure and true Church of Israel, and was also a doctrine of the enlightened men of the Gentile world; and thus bears the character of one of the original revelations of God to man, even before the deluge.

With this strong presumptive argument in our favor, we proceed to another topic, upon which we feel such certainty as makes us lay aside all hesitation. We know that the Saviour established his Church to teach his doctrine to the end of ages, and through the world; it would be preposterous indeed to suppose that within a few years and throughout the Christian world, error should be substituted for that doctrine by this Church; yet if ours be not the true doctrine, such was actually the fact; as is manifest by the various testimonies which I have adduced; testimonies of all the early lights of our predecessors in the faith. Have they all erred on this plain, important and vital subject; and if they have, how did the few subsequent sectarians of the middle ages obtain the knowledge of truth; and why are not they of the sixteenth century agreed amongst themselves? We are then brought to this conclusion; that the Christian Church has taught error in place of truth during the whole period of its existence, to the great bulk of those who received the Gospels: or else ours is the true doctrine.

The next topic regards the testimony of Christ himself and his Apostles in the New Testament, and the testimony of the sacred historians and the prophets in the Old Testament. We thus add the testimony of the Scriptures to that of tradition, and to that of prescription. To the assertion that we mistake the meaning of the passages of the sacred volume, we answer: first, that the great majority of interpreters is on our side; next, that the ancient commentators agree with us; and lastly, that the tribunal, whose explanation of the text we follow, is that from which we received the text itself, and without whose authority we could not ascertain what book was inspired, or what book was un-

worthy of credit; whilst our opponents follow the more recent, and the more few even of those recent, and deserting all the ancients, oppose the very tribunal from which the book was received. We, therefore, have upon our side the weight of evidence, for ours being the correct meaning of the text.

Another ground that we take, is, that a variety of customs and monuments are known to have existed in the early Church, and through the subsequent ages, which are utterly irreconcilable with the opinions of our opponents, but completely in accordance with our doctrine.

We add to these, the fact, that several of the most learned and prominent individuals amongst those who, as a body, have rejected the doctrine, testify to its antiquity and truth; and that it is received and acknowledged to be true in some of the first and most esteemed confessions of faith and liturgies.

There is one other topic which I shall briefly treat upon, before I conclude. The reasonableness of the doctrine in its conformity to what we know of the justice and of the mercy of God; and which reasonableness has been always acknowledged, until the unfortunate secession of the sixteenth century, when new principles were adopted to vindicate new doctrines. We behold in this world three classes of men; some extremely good, some extremely wicked, and a large portion whose lives exhibit a sort of middle disposition. We believe that they of the first class are, by the justice of heaven, if they die without repentance and the forgiveness of God through the merits of our Saviour, condemned to that hell, or to a place of eternal suffering; for them we have no hopes; for them prayer is unavailing; for them, that mercy which they have so much abused, will never be exerted. They who have been redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, whose souls are without stain, who, faithful to grace, have lived in holiness and perfection, will be admitted immediately after death to heaven, that blessed abode of eternal rest, where they shall enjoy the presence of their God. The souls in this state need not our prayers, because they now possess that which was the object of their desires and of our prayers. But how few are in this state of purity and perfection? What then becomes of the third class? Shall they be hurled with the reprobate to eternal perdition? Is mercy to be denied to them? Will no temporary affliction satisfy the justice of offended heaven? We say that justice requires punishment, but mercy extends relief to those who have sinned through infirmity, and not through malice; and that after a time of purgation [to] these souls, [which] will be more or less severe, and of longer or shorter duration, in the ratio of their offence. Thus, justice and mercy are conciliated.

The distinction between malice and infirmity forms the basis of the difference between mortal and venial sin; and he who dies in a state of malicious opposition to God's law, or malicious affection to sin, will continue unrepentingly malicious through eternity, and therefore justice will require his eternal punishment, whilst it will but afflict for a time the soul which sinned without that depraved disposition. And a merciful God will hear with condescension and mercy the prayers of the faithful for this afflicted soul. Charity will urge them to prayer, and the redeemed spirit will upon its admission into heaven, praise and adore its God and Redeemer, and pray in return for its benefactors; thus there exists that communion of saints, which Christians have always professed to believe, between the three portions of our Holy Church, militant on earth, and triumphant in heaven, and suffering in purgatory.

A doctrine of religion which is manifestly taught in a very great number of places in the sacred Scriptures is, that when God remits the repentant sinner, the eternal punishment due to sin, whose guilt he has taken away, he generally substitutes a temporary punishment of a definite extent, but which extent, though known to him, is generally unknown to us; should the pardoned sinner die without having undergone the entire of this penalty, he will, according to our belief, suffer the unsatisfied portion in a state of purgation, before his admission into heaven, and unless such be the case, he must either receive from God a new remission, for which we have no evidence, or he will enter heaven indebted to the divine justice, which is against every principle of Christian faith; or what is more revolting to our ideas of God, he will be consigned to hell, though saved therefrom by redemption. We therefore say, that, besides those who die in venial sin, they also die indebted to God's justice for unexpiated temporal punishment, will be consigned to a temporary purgation.

Before I close this letter, allow me to remark the consequence of denying the existence of this middle and temporary state, and of insisting upon the belief of only heaven and hell; it has led vast multitudes, who found in the Scriptures, and in common sense, and tradition, the evidence of Purgatory, to convert Hell itself into a place of only temporary endurance; so that, at present, the great majority of the Protestant sections, who were led to deny our doctrine, have found themselves under the necessity of resuming what they had cast away, and casting away what they had at first retained. Hence, not only have we professed Universalists, who believe that all mankind will ultimately be saved, when the wicked shall have undergone a temporary purgation, but amongst the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the

Baptists, the Unitarians, and a variety of other Protestants, the greater number of individuals disbelieve the existence of hell, and believe that of purgatory. [56]

I remain, yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER XLVIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 3, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—The next portion of Blanco White's book that I take up is the following passage, page 95,

"The worship of saints, relics, and images might, when tradition began to spread it, have appeared less connected with the wealth and power of the Church of Rome; yet none of its spiritual resources have proved more productive of both. Europe is covered with sanctuaries and churches, which owe their existence and revenues to some reported miraculous appearance of an image, or the presence, real or pretended, of some relic. To form a correct notion of the influence which such places have upon the people, it is necessary to have lived where they exist. But the house of Loretto alone, would be sufficient to give some idea of the power and wealth which the Church must have derived from similar sources, when the whole of Christendom was more ignorant and superstitious than the most degraded portions of it are at present. Of this fact, however, I am perfectly convinced by long observation, that were it possible to abolish sanctuaries, properly so called, and leave the same number of churches without the favorite virgins and saints which give them both that peculiar denomination and their popular charm; more than half the blind deference which the multitude pay to the clergy, and through the clergy to Rome, would quickly disappear."

In this he does not object to the veneration which we pay to saints, to relics and to images, but by two unbecoming tricks, he misrepre-

[56] Bishop England's statement that "amongst the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Unitarians, and a variety of other Protestants, the greater number of individuals disbelieve the existence of hell" was questioned by the editors of the first edition of this work. We believe that now, at least, the statement is strictly accurate. Outside the Catholic Church belief in hell is a rarity. Insistence on this doctrine is, on all sides, construed into an insult against the mercy of God. Hell is a theme that has no place in the Protestant pulpit. Even among Catholics who boast of their Latitudinarianism, hell, as a place of eternal punishment in which are inflicted the frightful torments described by Catholic writers, is fast becoming a very uncertain quantity in the sum of revealed doctrines.—ED.

sents our doctrine and practice—he uses the word "worship" as the word to govern the three objects, when he must have known that we do not worship relics, that we do not worship images; and when he must have known that by the word *worship*, his Protestant readers are generally led to understand *adoration*: in which sense he must have known that we do not worship saints: his first trick was in using that equivocal verb to mislead his readers by one meaning whilst he could contend with us for the use of the word in another meaning: this dishonesty is usual with writers of his description: and I know of no words sufficiently strong to express my condemnation and more than pity for persons the badness of whose cause and the disingenuity of whose minds urges them to such a course. His second trick was in writing under the government of this verb three objects to which totally dissimilar honor or request is paid.

Let us look to our profession of faith, as contrasted with his misrepresentation. "I hold that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honored and invoked; and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be respected." Such is the doctrine of our Church; instead of which White makes us say "the saints are to be worshipped." Yet the reverend junta tells us that White is an excellent expositor of our doctrine and a moderate reprover of our errors! As to images, our profession says: "the images of Christ, of the mother of God, ever virgin, and also of other saints, may be had and retained: and that due honor and veneration is to be given to them." White says that we teach to worship them. Thus the entire basis of his observations is an implied calumny.

I said that he did not examine the truth or falsehood of the doctrine, the correctness or incorrectness of the practice, but condemns us because the practice has a tendency to give the clergy "an influence upon the people." Is it then a mark of false religion that its clergy possess an influence upon its professors? If so, the Protestant Episcopal Church belongs to a false religion, the religion of the Presbyterians is false, and surely so is that of the Methodist: there is not in the world a true religion, because there is not a sect or division whose clergy has not more or less influence on its professors: the religion of the Apostles was the most removed from truth, because no body of clergy ever did possess so much influence upon their flocks, as the sacred college did over their disciples.

Were I to enter upon this topic as it would require, I could show you that under the semblance of liberty, the various sects of Protestants are more completely influenced by their clergy than are our laity by

our clergy. In truth, there are very few Protestant clergymen of any denomination in America who do not possess and exercise more despotic authority over the opinions and actions of their flocks than any Pope ever dared to aspire to.

Upon this subject of influence, I shall make one general observation; it is necessary that the clergy should possess it to a certain extent; but to possess it is not criminal, nor is it criminal to obtain it by lawful and proper means: but it is criminal to use dishonest or unbecoming means to procure it, and if possible more criminal to abuse it when it has been obtained. If the doctrine of the Church be true; and if her practices are founded upon this doctrine, the influence naturally and fairly arising from that practice cannot be improperly acquired. That it might have been in some instances abused, I am prepared to admit, but so has the influence arising from a variety of other true doctrines and pious practices. But the abuse might be corrected without the destruction of the doctrine: as I have somewhere read; it is not necessary to demolish a ship for banishing the vermin with which it is infested: nor would a wise man burn his residence to destroy its cobwebs.

Mr. Blanco White assumes what I am not ready to concede, when he insinuates that there was a time "when the whole of Christendom was more ignorant and superstitious than the most degraded portions of it are at present." I deny the truth of this insinuation: and I will undertake to maintain against any of the reverend junta of his approbators the following propositions.

1. That the whole of Christendom was never since the reign of Constantine sunk into more religious ignorance and superstition, than the whole of Eugland and Wales is at the present moment.

2. That there is less knowledge of the doctrine of Christ at the present moment in England and Wales, than in any other part of Europe, except Russia, Sweden, Norway and Denmark.

3. That there is not in Europe a people so much given to the ignorant superstition of believing in omens, dreams, charms and fortune telling, as the Protestant people of England.

I know what bold assertion and rhetorical declamation have done to create the contrary impression; but I shall require facts, and will give facts in answer; I shall pay no attention to vaporing or declamation; neither will I admit that the authorized ceremonial of one Church is superstitions, nor assume that the practice of the other is so.

I now meet White upon his own ground of conviction, and try him by his own test. And I state a notorious fact. In Ireland there is not, I believe, a single sanctuary of the description which he mentions;

should there be a few, they make no account in the general view. Here then is the very case in which he asserted that "more than half the blind deference which the multitude pay to the clergy, and through the clergy to Rome, would quickly disappear." Yet the Irish are said to be the most blindly deferential multitude to their clergy and to Rome of any people in the world. So that the gentleman has had the benefit of his test and lost its application: it even tells to his contradiction.

I thought here to make a passing remark upon the gross misconduct and irreligious demeanor in these States, of some persons who, in that island of saints, were apparently irreproachable, but this is not the place, nor is the present the occasion which I would select to exhibit the cause of this deplorable fatuity: it has produced lamentable effects; but I trust they are transient.

One word more upon this paragraph. Upon the subject of miracles; with the exception of those recorded in the Scripture, White ought to know that no Roman Catholic is bound to believe in the truth of any one, of the evidence to support which he is not fully satisfied: though he is bound by common sense and by revelation to believe that the hand of God is not shortened, nor his power lessened, and that he is as fully able to work a miracle to-day as he was in the days of Moses, or of the Apostles: and hence that if by the phrase, "the age of miracles is gone by," it is meant to convey the idea that God cannot now perform by himself or by his agents, those extraordinary and peculiar works, it is equally opposed to reason and to religion.

His next paragraph is that which follows, in page 96.

"The advantages resulting in Rome from the combined effect of indulgences, relics, saints and their images, are not, however, derived only indirectly through the deference enjoyed by her clergy. The bond thereby created between the Pope and the most distant regions which acknowledge his spiritual dominion, is direct. The Mexican and the Peruvian expects the publication of the annual bull, which allows him to eat eggs and milk in lent, enables him to liberate, by name, a certain number of his relations from purgatory, and enlarges the power of his confessor, for the absolution of the most hideous crimes. Wherever he turns, he sees a protecting saint, whose power and willingness to defend him, could not be ascertained without the supernatural and unquestionable authority of the Pope. It is the Holy Father who, by a solemn declaration, allots every district to the peculiar patronage of the saint; it is he who, by grants of indulgence, encourages the worship of those miraculous images which form central points of devotion over all the Roman Catholic world: it is he who warrants the supernatural state

of incorruption of the body of one saint, and traces, with unerring certainty, some straggling limb to another. It is, finally, he who alone has the undoubted power of virtually furnishing the faithful with the relics of the most ancient or unknown patriarchs and martyrs, by bidding the fragment of any skeleton in the catacombs, be part of the body in request. [57]

The first portion of this paragraph only goes to show that we are "one fold under one shepherd:" that we are trying to keep the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: one body and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all: until we come in the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things which is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body, fitly jointed together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase in the body, unto the edifying itself in love." (*Ephes.* iv.) I would ask any rational man, whether it be against the doctrine of the Apostle and of his divine Master, that this unity of the body should be produced by "giving some Apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, some teachers; for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," (*Eph.* iv,) by the fulfilment of the Saviour's prayer, "neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me, that they may all be one; as Thou Father in me, and I in thee, that they may be also one in us," and so forth (*John* xvii,) by the sort of unity which the Saviour exhibited as that to be established: "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also must I bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold; one shepherd." (*John* x.) The first portion of the paragraph asserts that the most distant nations are preserved in this unity by our practice. I say, it is internal evidence of the correctness of the practice.

The last portion is a blending of discreditable misrepresentation and palpable falsehood: of the first kind is the description of the annual

[57] "This is called christening relics. The persuasion that bones so christened are as good as those of the favorite saint to whom they are attributed, is certainly general in my country. I have no doubt that it is common to all Catholics."

bull, the nature and object of which has been heretofore described at length in the *Miscellany*; of the latter kind is the statement that it is the Pope who allots every district to the patronage of a peculiar saint: if White knew the law or practice of the Roman Catholic Church, he would have been aware that this is not done by the Popes, nor by the Bishops, nor by the Priests, but by the people; the next assertion is notoriously false, for as I have before shown, images, whether miraculous or not, are *not* worshipped, and their worship is neither encouraged nor tolerated: neither is it the Pope who warrants the state of incorruption of a saint, but medical men and other competent witnesses: but it is his decision which approves of the finding of the sufficiency of their testimony by the Congregation of Rites which cautiously re-examines the process and documents of the original tribunals before which the evidence was taken, and which the vituperator styles "tracing with unerring certainty some straggling limb to another." But in this case no person claims infallibility for the Pope, and of course the flourish about unerring certainty is delusive vaporing.

The gross untruth of the insinuation in the closing passage, taken together with the note, is well worthy of a man whose book is such a tissue as I have shown it to be. There are some assertions which it is very difficult to refute: of this description are those to which an allusion is made in the following very prudent advice: "If you mean to lie, do it boldly, and you will be the more likely to succeed: a timid liar is always suspected, but one who comes out with a face of brass and goes through unhesitatingly, will impose upon many and probably will succeed." The canon which restricts the final judgment and decision as to the authenticity of relics, was enacted in direct opposition to the principle insinuated by White. Previously to the Council of Lateran in 1215, several Bishops were found to be remiss in examining the evidence, and in the habit of too easily admitting insufficient proof to show that what was offered was truly a sacred relic; to remedy which, the sixty-second canon of that council reserved the revision and final judgment of the case to the Pope, thereby taking every human precaution against imposition or mistake. Of what value, then, is the declaration of a man, who tells you deliberately that this was giving to the Pope a power which he calls that of christening relics?

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER XLIX.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 13, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—It is next to impossible that any man who had received his education amongst Roman Catholics, as Blanco White did, could have been the author of the following passage:

"I do not intend to cast any part of your religious system into ridicule; though I confess it is difficult to mention facts like these, without some danger of exciting a smile. These and similar practices you will, perhaps, construe into innocent means of keeping up a sense of religion among the lower classes."

Every one so educated knows that we do not make use of any practice for the purpose of keeping up a sense of religion in any class of persons, unless we believe that practice to be in itself good and lawful; such a person must also know that we do teach to the rich and to the poor, to the learned and to the unlearned, the very same doctrines, and to all we recommend the very same practices. How could we hope to retain in our communion, wise, learned, and virtuous persons, if they were to know that we had recourse to trick, to delusion, and to imposition upon the lower classes? How could we retain the lower classes, among whom are great numbers who are better informed upon subjects of religion than any one of hundreds of learned philosophers whom I could at once designate?

I have seen it frequently stated, that Southey the poet is the author of this book to which Blanco White has lent his name; I have assumed, and shall continue to assume that the work belongs to him whose name it bears; but my suspicions, that such is not the fact, would have been excited by even this single passage; because it is unquestionably impossible, that any one who ever had been a member of our Church could entertain this notion: and because the notion is commonly entertained of us by Protestants, as I am well aware.

They tell us that it is a compliment to our understandings: I am very far from receiving any compliment at the price which they require for this; that price is the avowal of my being a hypocrite, a dissembler, a knave, an impostor; and an impostor, too, upon the most awful and tremendous of all subjects, the worship of God, the revelation of heaven, the eternal concerns of the human race. Can this be a compliment? Yet such is the politeness which we sometimes meet with! ! ! I do not at present choose to state what I know to be the true cause of this most extraordinary blending of kindness and of insult, of respect for our un-

derstandings and reproach for our mean deceit. Habit reconciles persons to many strange incongruities, and prejudice cloaks the most palpable contradictions from our view. How often have I, in secret, lamented the origin of this delusion, which I find so common amongst our separated brethren, but to which no instructed Catholic can for a moment be liable? Southey might have written this insolent, absurd, and unfounded charge: White might have written it in conformity to what was fashionable, but not to what he knew to be true. Our holy religion needs no aid from imposture; if it did, it could not be holy or true; if we used delusive means, they would not be innocent; our practices are alike recommended to all our members; had we one religion for the higher orders, another for the lower orders, we could not conceal the fact, and its detection would be justly the ruin of our cause. However, the very absurdity of the supposition will not prevent its repetition; the charge is nearly eighteen centuries of age; and should the world continue eighteen centuries more, it will be made against our successors as it has been against our predecessors, and as it is now made against us.

White proceeds thus:

"But without insisting, at present, upon their demoralizing and degrading tendency, I only present them in conjunction with all the other means of power and influence which the Church of Rome has drawn from the, at least, doubtful title, on which she grounds her spiritual supremacy."

This is what I complain of; he insinuates a charge which he dares not make; that those practices are demoralizing and degrading: he also assumes what he has not proved; that the spiritual supremacy of Rome is grounded on a doubtful title: this is indeed begging the question, or rather assuming as true that which has been totally disproved. But let us see his new mode of endeavoring to destroy the tenet which he failed in disproving before: page 98,

"It is, indeed, of great importance in the question between Rome and the Protestants, to observe the consequences of their respective interpretation of Scripture, in regard to their own interests. The mass of Christians who, unable to weigh the theological arguments urged by the controversialists of both parties, content themselves with an implicit, and often an indifferent, acquiescence in the tenets which education chanced to impress on their minds; might form a pretty accurate notion of the whole case, by the following easy and compendious method. They should, in the first place, endeavor to become familiar with the reasoning which shows the absurdity of settling the question of Papal supremacy on other than Scriptural grounds."

This is again begging the question; for it assumes what we deny, viz. That there is no other mode but the evidence of the Scripture for ascertaining the fact, that St. Peter was the supreme visible head of the Church after the death of Christ, and that his successors were to hold the same office to the end of the world. Allow me to exhibit the absurdity of this assumption in a very plain way.

If St. Peter had obtained this commission, he had it during the seven or ten years which elapsed between the ascension of our Saviour and the writing of the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, which is the first book of the Scriptures in which it could be written. Would his commission from Christ have been the less valid, because as yet no evangelist had written the testimony? Suppose it was not written until St. John wrote his *Gospel*, and that St. John did write the testimony of the facts in his *Gospel*, xxi 15, 16, 17, would not these facts have been true in all the time which intervened between the giving of the commission previous to the ascension, and its being writen by the evangelist sixty-five years after? Thus the validity of the commission of Peter would in either case have been believed, upon sufficient grounds, by millions of Christians before ever it was written in the Scriptures, and the evidence of the facts could also have reached us though no *Gospel* had been ever written. White here assumes another false principle, viz. that nothing is to be believed as true in religion, but what is found on record in the Bible. He has been pleased to say, that it would be absurd to believe otherwise. I must be excused for retorting, by declaring the absurdity of this assumption; and unless my position be correct, the great bulk of Christians in the first five ages were all guilty of the grossest folly, because they built their belief not upon the Scripture, but upon other grounds.

He next proceeds, page 98:

"Let them remember what cannot be too much repeated, the necessity of deriving the knowledge of any infallible expounder of the Scriptures from the testimony of those Scriptures, perused and understood without the aid of that expounder."

The reverend gentleman must excuse me, if I differ altogether from his position here; for again he assumes what he is not allowed, and has not proved, viz. that those books which he calls Scripture do contain the word of God. I have never yet known any Protestant seriously undertake to prove this: they always assume it as granted, and this is indeed very like what, in page 22, White calls "Christianity being a groundless fabric, the world supported by the elephant; the elephant standing on the tortoise." To know that these books contain the word of God,

presupposes a witness competent to testify that they are his word. The Catholics say, that, before St. Matthew wrote his *Gospel*, the infallible witness, the Church of Christ, existed, and that this witness still lives; and tells him as she told his predecessors in every age, that those books contain the word of God. The Protestant says, that she not only is fallible, but has misled millions of persons to damnable idolatry, and to other errors; that she is not to be trusted: of course, he has no witness in her testimony. Where then is his evidence that these books are the word of God? Or will he admit that she will give him, with infallible certainty, the written word of God, but will not give him its true meaning? Upon what will he ground his distinction? If she is infallible in giving the doctrine, the exposition of the Scripture's meaning is doctrine, and White's position is untenable.

The miserable ingenuity which this sentence contains is unworthy of even a venal poet. Mark the logic he would induce us to adopt, that he might hold us up to scorn after we should have been misled. First, we were to assume without evidence of the fact, that certain books contained the revealed will of God, and nothing but what he had revealed: next, being at a loss for the exact meaning of the words susceptible of divers interpretations and differently interpreted, we were to seek for an infallible interpreter, and to find him, we should commence by assuming to be infallible interpreters ourselves. Should we do this, White would very naturally turn about and tell us, that now we had adopted the Protestant principle of considering our own private judgment as the proper mode of learning the most important rule, that upon which all others depend: and as we commenced with this rule, it was equally good for a continuation. Our answer is short and simple, viz. The Church existed before the Scripture was written; at that time, she was the only guide which the faithful had; she was the only one given by Christ; from her, and not from Christ, they received the Scriptures; from her they also received their interpretation; she still continues, she still testifies: before any of the Scriptures were written, the fact of the supremacy of Peter and his successors was known; before they were all written, Rome had been selected by Peter as his seat, and he had successors therein, whose supremacy was notorious and recognised: thus, before an evangelist wrote a line, the infallibility of the Church was known and recognised; and, hence, the whole of White's assumptions are false in fact and absurd in principle.

He proceeds, page 98:

"To appeal to divine tradition as a rule for the interpretation of Scripture in this state of the question, is equally unreasonable and pre-

posterous; since from the nature of the cases, there is, as yet, no infallible rule to distinguish divine tradition from human and fallible report."

The fallacy and untruth of this passage is now evident.

"The next step in this momentous inquiry is to ascertain, by human means, the true sense of such passages of the Scriptures as are said to contain the appointment of a living supreme authority in matters of faith."

This might do very well for Protestants, Catholics need take no such step. Christ, by establishing his Church as their guide, has given them the authority; it has existed from his day to the present; and he declared, that it was to continue to the consummation of the world: then, but not till then, will the commission expire by its own limitation.

"Here, two sets of men deeply learned in all the branches of divinity, present themselves as interpreters. These affirm that the passages in question contain the rights and privileges which the Church of Rome and her head claim for themselves; those positively deny that the passages can bear such meaning. Remember again, I request you, that the decision must depend exclusively on the reasoning faculties of mankind."

This is just as if a man were to say: a law has been entrusted to the administration of a permanent court, which court expounds the same; but some men who have been disappointed by its decisions, without any color of a commission, erect themselves into a tribunal, and tell you that their decisions are more correct. Remember the commission of the State is to go for nothing, and the propriety of the decision is to be determined by the reasoning faculties of individuals. What is this but to assume against the fact, that Christ did not establish a Church before the evangelist wrote; and then tell the people that they were to pay the same regard to those who deny the fact as to the Church which he established? It might be a good delusion in the minds of the junta, to throw away a fact and its evidence, and then tell you to establish the fact without adducing the evidence, because they do not like to avow its truth: I prefer keeping things as they are; I hold with St. Augustine, that I would not know upon what rational grounds I could receive the Gospel, except by the testimony of the Church; and I must know the witness and the value of his testimony, before I can receive its results. The Catholic knows the Church first, and from that he receives the Scriptures. So it was in the early days of Christianity, in the days of the Apostles, and thence to the present day.

"Which, now, of these two opposed masses of intellect, is most

likely to catch the true meaning of the texts? Which of the two interpretations have we most reason to suppose free from the distortions of prejudice? Common sense answers the question: that which is directly against the interests of the interpreters."

I state it is the interest of the Protestant mass of intellect, to have the decision in favor of its own cause; and for private judgment, because it has been condemned by the public tribunal. White says:

"Europe lay prostrate at the feet of the Pope, and every member of his clergy was raised, by the common opinion, to a rank and dignity to which even kings bowed their head. The meanest priest claimed and enjoyed exemptions which were often denied to the first nobles of the land. Wealth and honors were theirs; the law shrunk before them, when guilt and piety were ready to throw a cloak on their vices. The Church had, for many ages, been in the possession of unrivalled power on earth, when, at the rousing voice of a few obscure men, who questioned the foundation of that mighty structure, a large portion of those that might have continued under its shelter, unanimously declared that the whole was a work of delusion, which had sprung from an original, unexamined error. Such was the unanimous conviction of all the Protestants, when no bias but that of a contrary tendency could exist in their minds. If common sense, therefore, must be the interpreter of divine authority, conveyed to us in human language, this fact alone suffices to point the side to which that plain and faithful guide gives its sanction."

The commencement of this rhapsody is a series of untruths, not a whit the more venerable for their frequent repetition by our opponents, from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the most ignorant stump bawler. There was no period during a long course of years when Europe was less under the influence of Rome than the very moment selected. So far from the clergy holding the place described, they were in many instances justly censured for great misconduct, and convicted and punished for their crimes: not only were their vices condemned by their superiors, but they were magnified and distorted, and multiplied by the people, who thus sought to palliate their own; and shorn of many of her privileges; as also stripped of several of her acquired prerogatives, the Church, though she had, during previous ages, possessed great power, was now a butt for every tyro at calumny, a theme for every unprincipled satirist: an object of plunder to every petty pillage-loving lordling, and though sound in her faith, wanting reformation in her discipline: like a stately vessel which had been long tossed in a tempestuous ocean, and now returned to harbor with her timbers good, and

her hull uninjured, but her cordage worn, her rigging in disorder, and her sails tattered; she was more unseemly to the eye than in favor with her surveyors. It was in such a moment as this, that a disappointed, ambitious friar began to complain, and soon found associates, whose unrestrained passions found in his interpretation of the sacred volume, their long looked-for sanction; yet the congregated band of discordant separatists, was but a miserable minority of a single patriarchate of the Western Church. White may boast, if he will, of the unanimous conviction of contradictory divisions, that it was necessary to destroy the authority of the tribunal which pronounced them all equally in error.

If common sense be the interpreter of divine authority conveyed to us in human language, and that common sense is to be found on the side of the vast majority, White's fact fails him: and our fact being applied to this principle, suffices to point out the guide which he seeks, in that Church which pre-existed to the Gospels; from which the Scriptures received that testimony without which they would be a dead letter; which taught the doctrine of Christ before those Scriptures were written; and which, in the midst of the early controvertists, decided who held their true meaning; which preserved them through centuries of persecution, and ages of anarchy, and presents them to us this day, together with the history of their perversion, and their application, and the evidence of their authority. If common sense be that which is most common, which is Catholic, which is predominant in every age and in every nation of Christianity, and which now, as in every other age, is the expressed conviction of the vast majority of the Christian, that is, the civilized world, that common sense informs us that the Catholic Church, which is united to the Bishop of Rome as its head, and the centre of its unity, has been established by Christ to give his doctrine with infallible certainty, down to the consummation of the world; and as that doctrine is to be found in the correct explanation of the written law where it is ambiguous, that Church could not be the correct teacher of his law, if she could mislead us in that interpretation, nor would he send her to teach and command us to hear error from her lips; and if she errs, to what source shall we turn for certain knowledge. Thus, White's effort was to delude his readers into the very vicious circle in which they falsely charge us with moving, or to the alternative which he gives, private and fallible judgment, which would establish that a thousand contradictions are all divine inspirations of truth, communications from heaven.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER L.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 17, 1827.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—I now lay before you the concluding passages of White's third letter.

"The Reformed Churches are taxed with their variations, as if, like Rome, they had pledged their existence upon infallibility. They have, indeed, varied and dissented from each other; with this difference from the oracular Church of the Vatican, that they have not disguised their proceedings, nor set up an Inquisition as the guard of their unity."

This again insinuates a plain falsehood, viz. that the unity of the Catholic Church is the result of the existence of the Inquisition. When White wrote those letters, the Inquisition did not exist in Spain, it did not exist in Portugal, it did not exist in South America, it did not exist in the East Indies, it did not exist in France, neither could it be said to exist in Italy: it never existed in any other part of the world: and the Catholic Church was and is in unity, though no such tribunal is now placed as its guard: she was in unity during twelve centuries before its institution: nor has the Irish Catholic been drawn away from that unity by the confiscations, the plunderings, the immoral and impious encouragement to children by bribing them with the family property for their seduction, by the imprisonments, the banishments, the gibbetings, and the worse than pagan oppression by which the Church of England sought and continues to seek its preservation. I say the Church of England, because with a very few honorable exceptions, it is her supreme head, her bench of Bishops, and her clergy and their connexions who have devised, and executed and perpetuated this worse than Dioclesian's code, to continue which, White himself has given his aid. "The only security of toleration must be a certain degree of intolerance, in regard to its enemies; as prisons in the freest governments are necessary for the preservation of freedom." For this he "volunteered his testimony in the great pending cause,"—when the question was concerning the repeal of this code which is to England a mantle of disgrace! Yet this is the man who writes of an Inquisition! ! !— The unity of doctrine in the Roman Catholic Church has subsisted and continues to subsist as well in affliction as in prosperity, equally firm and complete under the persecution of the Emperor of China, and the King of England, as in the free States of this continent, or in the Spanish dominions, or throughout the rest of Catholic Europe, where every man has perfect freedom of conscience. This precious passage

admits what could not be denied, that no Protestant Church can be certain that it teaches the doctrine of Christ: I do not understand what is meant by "disguising their proceedings."

"But while the love of truth compelled the Reformers to expose themselves to the insults and raillery of their mortal enemies, by breaking into parties upon the more abstruse points of divinity; not even a doubt has disturbed their unanimity as to the insufficiency of the title to divine supremacy, by which Rome commands intellectual homage."

There is nothing more natural than that all who withdraw from unity should assert that it is not necessary; that all who oppose the decisions of a tribunal, should deny its authority. This is an admirable unity! But what are the more abstruse points of divinity? Whether God is one in nature, and three in subsistence. The truth of this which is the most abstruse point of divinity, is for instance not to be ascertained by human sagacity; but by the simple knowledge of the fact that God said such was his nature and subsistence. If he said so; all they who believe in the doctrine of the Trinity are correct, all they who deny it are in error: the want of unity which we charge upon Protestants is not a want of unity of opinion, but a want of unity of doctrine, want of unity of Faith. What White calls the abstruse points of divinity are the doctrines which Christ revealed to man, and he acknowledges that the Reformers, as he calls them, "break into parties" respecting those doctrines. It is clear that as a body they teach glaring contradictions; it is equally plain that some, if not all of them, must teach what contradicts the doctrine of Christ, and no one of them can give us certainty that the contradiction is not taught by itself; thus, by the avowal of White and of the junta, in no Protestant communion can a person have certainty that he does not contradict what the Saviour taught. Mark then the state to which upon their principle Christendom is reduced. The Roman Catholic Church says that it will give the doctrines of revelation with infallible certainty. "No," they exclaim, "neither you nor we, nor any other body can so give them." Of course no human being can be certain that he knows what God has taught. Faith is the belief of what God has taught; that belief must be founded upon certainty: by destroying certainty, they subvert Faith:

"That, indeed, was the only point of controversy which common sense could decide; and the renunciation of all the worldly advantages to which the Roman Church invited the Reformers, had left their judgment unbiassed."

Suppose I grant the truth of the first supposition; history forbids me to grant that of the second. The Reformers, as they are called, had

almost all their worldly motives against the truth. The first princes who in Germany and in England protected the dogmatizers, had their worst passions to gratify; and found that gratification opposed by the Roman Catholic Church, and sanctioned by the Reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Corvin, Bucer, Adam, Leningue, Wintferte, Melander, Cranmer, and so forth. They renounced no worldly advantages to which the Roman Church invited them.

"Other disputes in divinity must be settled by a long, difficult and laborious process of inquiry; but a privilege is a matter of fact which, if not evidently proved, becomes a nonentity."

I thought that the Scriptures made "divinity" very easy to the meanest capacity, so that all who could read the Scriptures, might understand divinity, but it seems White is coming back to his Catholic principles, that common sense will first exhibit to you a witness, and the witness will then testify what God revealed. This is our Catholic principle.

"Now, the peculiar privilege claimed by Rome, essentially precludes doubtful proofs of its existence. A doubtful gift from God with a view to remove doubt, is a mockery of his wisdom. If the common sense of many learned and unbiassed minds is found to agree in denying that the Scripture passages alleged by Rome, in favor of her miraculous infallibility, contain a clear promise of that gift, or describe in whom, and how it was to exist after the decease of the Apostles; the pretensions of the Pope and his Church must be visionary."

By no means, until it is first shown that there is no other mode of knowing the truth of a fact but from the Scripture. This is the old fallacy: to assert that our proof of the existence of an infallible tribunal is derived only from the Scripture: and, that the common sense of a minority is the proper rule for interpreting the Scripture. Now we admit neither position; we say that before the Scripture was written, evidence existed of the facts that Christ had made St. Peter head of the Church, and that this office was to continue with his successors, and that Christ made that Church the infallible witness of his doctrine. Common sense observed and acknowledged these facts before St. Matthew wrote his Gospel, therefore it is not from that Gospel the proof was first had, although that Gospel was the first written portion of the New Testament; and what common sense then without the aid of Gospel knew to be facts, might be exhibited as facts to us, although they should never have been recorded in the sacred volume.

Again, suppose I were to admit that amongst the Protestants there were many learned and unbiassed minds: I hope it would be admitted

that amongst the Catholics there were also many learned and unbiassed minds: and if, as is the fact, the Catholics are four times as numerous as all the Protestant sects united, I have four times as many learned and unbiassed minds for the Catholic, as I have for the Protestant explanation, unless the senseless, arrogant and untenable position were taken that a Catholic cannot be as learned or as unbiassed as a Protestant. In Great Britain this has been attempted, and in America there is a strong disposition amongst some Protestants to take the same ground; but like many other old British follies it is on the wane. Thus if common sense of learned men with equally unbiassed minds, or minds equally biassed to opposite sides, be the proper interpreter of Scripture passages: common sense being the sense of the great majority, not that of the small minority, the Catholic explanation is that which is correct and not doubtful.

In all this I have given to White an unfair advantage, because I have not pressed what I could and what is the fact, that when without the aid of Scripture, I learned the infallibility of the Church, from common sense, I then learned from the same source that this infallible Church and not her disunited opponents, was the tribunal to give me its accurate meaning. To admit a Protestant interpretation in such a case, would be like setting up the rejected glosses of a non-suited litigant, as of equal authority with the decision of a supreme court of appeals.

"The negative proof, in such cases,—the absence of a clear title—has the strength of demonstration. Nothing can weaken its force upon a candid mind, but the very common habit of starting away from newly discovered truth in fear of its consequences, which we have previously condemned.

"I am aware that, unable as you must be to find a direct and sufficient answer to this argument, and inclined to admit its truth, as an honest mind will make you; yet a crowd of such consequences will deter you from the path into which reason is ready to lead you.—A Church subject to error and division!—You shrink from such an inference, without remarking that the preconceived and unproved necessity of having an infallible Church, is the true and only source of that illogical process, by which you have endeavored to establish the certain existence of infallibility, upon the uncertain sense of a few words of the Gospel."

The whole of this is now but empty sound, and false suggestion; because it is not upon the uncertain meaning of a few words of the Gospel, but upon a notorious fact, as also upon the very nature of faith, that we establish the certain existence of infallibility. Those I have before given

as positive arguments, hence we have a clear title, and it is unfair to say that we have not.

I shall conclude my remarks upon this topic by stating that our opponents avow that they cannot with certainty know or teach what God has revealed, and yet they assume to be teachers of God's law! ! ! They state that our unity is the result of persecuting those who differ from us. We have suffered more, at least four times more, from Protestant persecutors, within three centuries, than all the victims of the Inquisition have endured throughout the world since the establishment of that tribunal; and the Inquisition is not a religious but a political tribunal, which has never existed as a mere ecclesiastical institution; it was found only in a very few Catholic nations, and only during particular epochs: its victims have not been Protestants, seldom has a Protestant been convicted in its court, but a vast multitude of its prisoners were delinquents in the most atrocious degree against the most sacred laws of nature, who in any civilized, and even in many savage nations, would be given up to infamous capital punishment; others were criminals who suffered for various heavy transgressions of law relating to general religion, such as sacrilege; others whom the Inquisition gave to the fire, would indeed in New England, or in old England, have only been hanged for witchcraft and sorcery. Our unity is not a result of the Inquisition, but of our belief in the competency of the Church to testify to us with infallible certainty the revelation of God. In this belief the vast majority of Christendom now is, and has been always united. The Church then assumes to be the teacher of God's doctrine, because she knows that doctrine with infallible certainty.

Nor is this certainty grounded upon the vicious semblance of reasoning which our opponents impute to us; but upon the notorious facts, that before the Scriptures were written, Christ formed the Church, commissioned her to teach, commanded men to hear, and promised that he would lead her into all truth, and remain with her to the end of the world that she might be enabled to fulfil her high duty of teaching. And although when the Scriptures were written those facts were recorded upon the sacred page, still they were true and notorious before the record was made, and would have continued equally true and notorious though the Gospel never had been written. Each division testifies truly of itself; the Roman Catholic Church, when she says, "By virtue of the divine commission I will with infallible certainty exhibit to you the doctrines of the Most High;" and the so called Reformers, when they say, "We are not certain which are the doctrines of Heaven, we pretend to no infallibility, but we tell you our opinions." We want no opinions,

we desire the testimony of doctrine, for the foundation of our Faith. Faith is the belief of what God teaches, not of what might be human opinion. Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER LI.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends: I proceed to consider White's fourth letter, the title of which is the following:

"A specimen of the unity exhibited by Rome. Roman Catholic distinction between infallibility in doctrine, and liability to misconduct. Consequences of this distinction. Roman Catholic unity and invariableness of Faith, a delusion. Scriptural unity of faith."

He commences his letter with the apparent fairness of quoting only from ourselves for our own condemnation.

" 'So long since as the council of Vienne (I quote the words of your great champion, Bossuet, translated by your apologist Mr. Butler[58]) a great prelate, commissioned by the Pope to prepare matters to be treated upon, laid down for a groundwork to the whole assembly, that they ought to reform the Church in the head and members. The great schism which happened soon after, made this saying current, not among particular doctors only, as Gerson, Peter d'Ailly, and other great men of those times, but in councils too; and nothing was more frequently repeated in those of Pisa and Constance. What happened in the council of Basil, where a reformation was unfortunately eluded, and the Church re-involved in new divisions, is well known.' Such is the picture of the Roman Catholic Church at the beginning of the fifteenth century, drawn by the most able as well as cautious of her divines."

Not a word is here said of reforming doctrine.

To show the want of that candor to which he pretends, it will only be necessary for me to give you the entire paragraph which he has garbled.

"A reformation of Church discipline was wished for, several ages since. 'Who will grant me,' cried St. Bernard, 'to see, before I die, the Church of God such as she was in primitive times?' If this holy man had any thing to regret at his death, it was, that he had not seen so happy a change. His whole life long, he bemoaned the grievances of the Church. He never ceased giving notice of them to the people, the clergy, the Bishops, the Popes themselves. Nor did he conceal his sentiments

[58] *Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, p. 156, 1st ed.

on this head from his own religious, who partook of his affliction in their solitude, and so much the more gratefully extolled the divine goodness, which had drawn them to it, as the world was more universally corrupted. Disorders had but increased since that time. The Roman Church, the mother of Churches, which had for nine whole ages, by setting the first example of an exact observance of ecclesiastical discipline, maintained it throughout the universe to her utmost power, was not exempt from evil.'' [59]

This precedes the paragraph quoted by White; now read what follows his quotation:—

''The disorders of the clergy, chiefly those in Germany, were represented in this manner to Eugenius IV, by Cardinal Julian: 'These disorders,' said he, 'excite the people's hatred against the whole ecclesiastical order, and should they not be corrected, it is to be feared, lest the laity, like the Hussites, fall foul on the clergy as they loudly threaten us.' If the clergy of Germany were not speedily reformed, he foretold, that to the heresy of Bohemia although it were extinguished, another still more dangerous would soon succeed; 'for it will be said,' proceeded he, 'that the clergy are incorrigible and will apply no remedy to their disorders. When they shall find no hopes left of our amendment,' continued this great Cardinal, 'then will they fall upon us. The minds of men are big with expectation of what measures will be taken, and full ripe they seem for something tragical? The rancour they have imbibed against us becomes manifest; they will soon think it an agreeable sacrifice to God, to plunder and abuse ecclesiastics, as abandoned to extreme disorders, and hateful to God and man. The new but small remains of respect to the sacred order, will shortly be quite extinguished. The blame of these abuses will be thrown on the court of Rome, which will be reckoned the sole cause thereof, because it had neglected to apply the necessary remedy.' 'I see,' said he, 'the axe is at the root: the tree begins to bend, and, instead of propping it whilst we may, we hasten on its fall.' He foresees a speedy desolation in the German clergy. The desire of taking from them their temporal goods, was to be the first spring of motion: 'bodies and souls,' says he, 'will perish together. God hides from us the prospect of our dangers, as he is used to do with those he designs to punish: we see the fire enkindled before us, and yet run headlong into it.'

''Thus did this Cardinal, the greatest man of his time, lament in the fifteenth century the abuses of those days: and foresee their dreadful

[59] *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches.* Book I.

consequences; whereby he seems to have foretold those evils which Luther was just going to involve all Christendom in, beginning by Germany; nor was he mistaken, when he foreboded that a despised reformation, and redoubled hatred against the clergy, would speedily bring forth a sect more terrible to the Church, than that of the Bohemians. Under Luther's banner did this sect appear, and assuming the title of Reformers, gloried they had fulfilled all Christendom's desires, inasmuch as a Reformation had long been the desire of Catholics, people, doctors, and their prelates. In order therefore to authorize this pretended Reformation, whatsoever church-writers had said against the disorders both of the people, and even of the clegy, was collected with great industry. But in this lay manifest deceit, there not being so much as one of all the passages alleged, wherein those doctors ever dreamt of altering the Church's Faith; of correcting her Worship, which chiefly consisted in the sacrifice of the Altar; of subverting the Authority of her prelates, that of the Pope especially, the very scope this whole Reformation, introduced by Luther, tended to."

Thus in those desires of reformation there was no expression of either an intention or right to change the doctrine; and however reprehensible the conduct of several of the clergy might have been, there was no deviation from the faith, no variance in doctrine between them and the purest and most holy members of the Church. The writer then proceeds to exhibit what he asserts to be the cause why reformation was eluded.

"The distinct mention of the unfortunate cause which prevented the proposed Reformation, would have given more color and individuality to the picture. It was, in fact, a revival of the great schism, which for fifty years had lately kept the Roman Catholic Church divided between two or three Popes, who at one and the same time, claimed the prerogative of vicars of Christ: it was a fierce contest between the council of Constance and Eugenius IV, the Pope who had convened it, and whom the assembled Bishops wished to reform: it was a sentence of excommunication issued by the council against Eugenius: it was a rival council convoked at Ferrara by the excommunicated Pope, where he employed the same arms against the fathers assembled at Basil: it was, in fine, the triumph of Rome against the spirit which had attempted to execute the work, of which 'great prelates,' 'particular doctors,' and 'councils too,' spoke so frequently, as to establish it into a 'current saying,' that the Church needed reform in head and members. The head, unwilling to be reformed, imprecated the curse of Heaven upon the members; and the members finding that head incurable, chose for themselves

another, when they had duly devoted the refractory one to the unquenchable fire. Such are the 'well-known' events which took place in 'the council of Basil, where a reformation was unfortunately eluded, and the Church re-involved in new divisions.' "

I have been greatly astonished at the number of mistakes in this paragraph. Before I examine its general untruth I shall remark upon one of the most striking particulars merely for the purpose of showing how little reliance is to be placed upon the historical accuracy of this most learned M. A., B. D., in the University of Seville; Licentiate of Divinity in the University of Osuna; formerly Chaplain Magistral (Preacher) to the King of Spain, in the Royal Chapel at Seville: Fellow, and once Rector, of the college of St. Mary a Jesu of the same town; Synodal Examiner of the Diocess of Cadiz; Member of the Royal Academy of Belles-lettres of Seville, and so forth; now a clergyman of the Church of England;—Author of *Doblado's Letters* from Spain: supported by the recommendations of so many of our eminent American clergymen.

The council of Constance was convoked in the year 1413 by Pope John XXIII, and its first session was held on the 16th of November of the following year; it having been opened on the 5th of that month. John XXIII, and Gregory XII, having resigned their pretensions to the Papacy in 1415, and the anti-Pope Benedict XII, having been deposed in 1417. Martin V was elected in that year, and the last session of the council was held on the 22d of April, 1418. Pope Martin V lived to the year 1431, which was thirteen years after the close of the council of Constance, and was succeeded by Eugenius IV, in that year; which was eighteen years after the convention of the council of Constance. Yet this accurate historian and his abettors make Eugenius convene this council so many years before he was Pope: and make him enter into a fierce contest with a council with which he had no difference. This will suffice to show how little dependence is to be placed upon the statements of fact in this book. In a variety of other passages a like ignorance and inaccuracy is manifested.

I shall not however deny that there was a serious difference between Pope Eugenius and the Bishops asembled at Basil, but the nature of that difference is unfairly exhibited by this uncandid writer. In order fully to understand the case, it will be necessary for you to know something of the history of what White calls the *great schism*, and then to see its sequel in this most melancholy epoch of the Church.

In the commencement of the 14th century, Bertrand Archbishop of Bordeaux in France, was elected Pope: and in place of going to Rome

to be crowned, he ordered the Cardinals and others to meet him at Lyons, where his inauguration took place in the Church of St. Justus on Sunday the 14th of November, 1305; he taking the name of Clement V. After passing the intermediate time in other parts of France, he came to Avignon in the spring of 1309, where he took up his abode; and died on his way towards Bordeaux, in 1314. His successor, John XXII, a Frenchman, was also crowned at Lyons: meantime Italy became a prey to the Guelphs and Ghibbelines and to other parties of marauders: Louis of Bavaria, especially, went to Rome and roused the passions of the people against John, whom he accused of a variety of crimes, especially of not residing in his see, though frequently besought, and usurping an authority to which he had no claim; he pronounced sentence of deposition against the Pope, and asked the crowd if they desired to elect in his stead one, who, thus improperly and invalidly selected, took the name of Nicholas V. The partizans of this faction used all means to vilify the character of John. Two years afterwards, this anti-Pope made his submission to John, who died about four years subsequently, on the 4th of December, 1334. He was succeeded by another Frenchman, Benedict XII. The Romans sent a request to Benedict that he would go to the capital city; he stated it to be his intention; but subsequently finding the States of Italy in turmoil, he remained at Avignon, and died in 1342. Clement VI, another Frenchman, was his successor. At this time, Joan, Queen of Naples, who, as countess of Provence, owned Avignon, being in great want of money, sold that city to the Holy See; which sale was ratified by Emperor Charles IV, such ratification being required for this sale, as Avignon was a fief of the empire. The ratification took place in 1348; Clement died in 1352; and was succeeded by Innocent VI, a Frenchman, who died in September, 1362, and was succeeded by another Frenchman, Urban V. This prelate determined upon going to Rome, but when in 1366 he began to make preparations for his removal, the King of France used his utmost efforts to dissuade him therefrom; amongst those who particularly urged him to go, was the famous Petrarch. In April 1367 Urban departed from Avignon and arrived at Rome on the 16th of October, of the same year, sixty-three years since Benedict XI left that city; here he staid, nearly three years, and returned to Avignon, to endeavor as he said to reconcile the French and English nations then opposed to each other; he died at Avignon on the 19th of December of that year; and was succeeded by another Frenchman, Gregory XI, who was consecrated on the vigil of Epiphany, 1371. The Roman people sent to request his residence, and he declared his determination to comply with their very reasonable in-

vitation. In August 1376 he was again waited upon by the Roman ambassadors, and was assured by several that his neglect would be attended with disastrous consequences. The King of France used every effort to detain him at Avignon. The Pope left this city on the 13th of September, 1376, and arrived in Rome on the 17th of January, 1377: many attempts were made to induce his return to Avignon, but he died at Rome on the 7th of March, 1378: shortly after his death the great schism commenced. I thought it necessary to lay before you this sketch of history, that you might be better able to form a correct judgment of the nature of that calamitous event. You will observe that between the persons who desired that the Pope should reside at Rome, and those who wished his residence at Avignon, there was a perfect accord and consent upon every doctrine of Faith: also, they agreed that the Bishop of Rome was and ought to be the visible head of the Church, and that this Church was but one body, from which any separation would be unlawful, schismatical and criminal. You will also observe the difference between schism which is an obstinate separation of one's self from the obedience due to the proper officers of the Church, and a disposition to obey that proper authority, but a doubt as to which of two contending parties holds it, or a mistake in the decision, whereby a person innocently adheres to the person who is the usurper. You will also observe a wide difference between schism itself and heresy, which is an obstinate refusal to believe what God has revealed. I now proceed to say that supposing a disputed election for any office in this Union, and that a number of the citizens did adhere to one candidate, asserting that he was properly and constitutionally chosen, whilst a number of others adhered to his opponent, alleging that he was the constitutional officer: suppose this to be the case in the office of our President, and that several of the States adhered to one, and the remainder to another; that the Congress was in like manner divided; however unfortunate such a state of things might be, still both parties would acknowledge the constitutional doctrine, yet each would call the other an usurping faction. Still would our constitution subsist. After various fruitless efforts to put a stop to such a state of things, suppose a convention of the States to assemble and to depose or drive to a resignation the rival pretenders, and to elect a new President and re-unite Congress, would not our constitution have survived the storm? Would not our President be the lawful successor of those who had previously held that office? Would he not have the same power which the constitution gave to them? And would we not be the same body that we were before? I shall show you in my next that our case is even better than what I have now described, in that period

which is denominated the *great schism.* But I must reserve this for my next.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER LII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 21, 1828.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—The object which I have in view is to show you that during the *great schism*, neither party deviated from the doctrine of the Church. but all those concerned in it held a common faith: and also, that the succession of the Bishops of Rome was not lost by the melancholy occurences of that period.

In my last I have shown you how the Popes came to reside at Avignon during the space of about seventy years: though residing in France, they were still Bishops of Rome, heads of the Church, and the successors of St. Peter. You will easily conceive how the citizens of Rome must have been mortified and displeased at this abandonment of their city: and how when Gregory XI died amongst them and the Cardinals, whose right it was to elect his successor, were to meet not at Avignon but at Rome, the people naturally dreading that if a Frenchman were chosen he might continue to hold his court at Avignon, began to cry out for a Roman, or at all events, an Italian Pope; threatening that if any other was chosen they would revenge it upon his electors. In this state of things, Bartholemew de Pregnano, Archbishop of Bari, was selected. When this came to be known, several persons mistook the title for the name, and under the impression that the Cardinals had fixed upon John de Bar, a Frenchman, they broke into the Conclave and assailed the electors, who fled in different directions. Others under the impression that the Cardinal of St. Peter's was elected, violently seized upon him, clothed him with Pontifical habits, and began to pay him the usual marks of respect. This Cardinal declared that he had not been chosen, and would never be Pope, upon which the disappointed crowd abused him.

Next day the Archbishop of Bari informed the magistrates of his election, but added that he could no nothing until the Cardinals would make the usual proclamation, and give him possession. About a dozen of the Sacred College were brought together, who proclaimed him Pope, under the name of Urban VI, and gave him possession, and assisted at his coronation on the eighteenth day after, which was Easter Sunday; and on the subsequent day they wrote to inform the Cardinals who were at Avignon, that the election had been free and canonical.

Meantime a number of the French Cardinals wrote to their king that the election was invalid and uncanonical, because of the want of freedom of the Cardinals, and the violence of the Roman people.

Urban's manners were harsh and unaccommodating, and he treated the Cardinals in such a manner as to excite their discontent; thirteen French Cardinals retired from Rome to Anagni, and sent him a protest against the validity of his election, withdrawing their obedience; they also published a manifesto to the Catholic world, in which they stated that in the election they were forced to act against their judgments by the violence of the people. Having prevailed upon three Italian Cardinals to join them, they assembled under the protection of Joan of Naples, at Fondi, in her territories, and elected as Pope five months after the election of Urban, Robert, Cardinal of the twelve Apostles, brother to Amadeus, count of Geneva, a Swiss, who took the name of Clement VII, [and] went to Avignon.

Let us now see the exact state of the question. In the first place there was no difference in doctrine; next, there was no deviation from the principles that the Bishop of Rome is the visible head of Christ's Church and that all persons are bound to be of that Church, and in communion with its head. But there was a serious doubt as to a particular fact, viz. whether Urban had been freely and canonically elected. In such a case the duty of a good Christian, upon Catholic principles, is to wait patiently the result of the examination by the proper tribunal, and meantime to be disposed to submit to the decision of that tribunal, which in the last resort is a general Convention of the whole Church in a council of its Bishops. Frequently these Bishops could examine the evidence in their Sees, and decide without assembling, and the agreement of a great majority would remove the doubt and settle the question.

In the present case such a decision was not speedily had, and therefore the Church was divided. Urban was recognised as duly elected, by the Germans, Hungarians, English, Irish, Bohemians, Poles, Danes, Swedes, Prussians, Norwegians, Dutch, Tuscans, Lombards, Milanese, and other Italians, save the Neapolitians, and by some of the Spaniards: whilst Naples, most of Sicily, Scotland, Arragon, Castile, Navarre, Savoy, and Lorraine, declared their belief of the invalidity of the election of Urban, and their adherence to Clement. France declared at first her neutrality, until a decision should be made by a general council, but in the course of a few months she adhered to Clement, whilst several Spanish Bishops withdrew from Urban and appealed to the decision of a council, which could not be easily assembled, owing to the wars and dissensions of that period: meantime each division accused the other of schism,

and each of the claimants created Cardinals: more than once, too, several States withdrew from one obedience and joined the other. Spain joined Clement, but Portugal adhered to Urban. He died on the 15th of October, 1389, at Rome. In place of endeavoring to effect a reconciliation, and put an end to the schism, the Cardinals who were at Rome proceeded to an election, and chose Bonifice IX, and not only was the schism continued, but the calamities of war also spread more widely. As it was unlikely that a council could assemble, it was proposed to Boniface and Clement, either that both should resign, and permit all the Cardinals to make a new election; or submit to the decision of the umpires, chosen by themselves: these requests were ineffectual. Clement died at Avignon in September, 1394, and notwithstanding the entreaties of Boniface and of several of the secular powers, the Cardinals who were there, after two days deliberation, on the 28th of the same month, chose Cardinal Peter de Luna, who took the name of Benedict XIII. The nations of Europe became more earnest in their design to close this schism. The University of Oxford recommended a council; the University of Paris recommended the resignation of both Prelates. Boniface stated that if Benedict would resign, he would immediately follow his example. In 1398 France withdrew from the obedience of Benedict and appealed to a council; most of the other nations followed this example; and most of the Cardinals who were at Avignon left the city and recommended the assemblage of a council; still however they returned, as did France and Castile to the obedience of Benedict. Boniface died in Rome in 1404. The Cardinals in that city chose Innocent VII, who was succeeded two years afterwards by Gregory XII. At the request of the greater portion of the Christian States, the Cardinals of both sides met in 1408, to deliberate on what was the best mode of proceeding, and they determined, that although under ordinary circumstances, no council ought to be called, but by the authority of the Pope, still in such a case as the present, they being aware of the wishes, of the great body, and representing the Church, could and ought to call upon the Prelates to convene, and they accordingly summoned them to meet at Pisa; and each division of Cardinals wrote to its chief, requiring his resignation for the benefit of the Church.

Thus we perceive that the question throughout was not one of doctrine, but merely a question of fact, whether Urban VI had been canonically elected: if he was, the Prelates who sat in Rome were the successors of St. Peter: if he was not, the succession was found at Avignon.

On the 25th of March, 1409, the assembly took place at Pisa. There were present, twenty-two Cardinals, four Latin Patriarchs, twelve Arch-

bishops in person, and fourteen by proxy, eighty Bishops in person, and one by proxy, besides a great number of abbots, generals of orders, priors, and deputies of Universities and of chapters, together with a long train of ambassadors. In this assembly, after Benedict and Gregory had been duly summoned and did not appear, they were declared guilty of abetting schism, contumacious and deposed: the Cardinals of both creations were ordered to proceed to the election of a Pope, and on the 20th day of June, 1409, they unanimously chose Peter, a native of the island of Candia, who took the name of Alexander V. He was a man noted for his virtue. England, Portugal, France, Ireland, Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and the greater part of Italy immediately acknowledged him: still the two former claimants refused submission: within less than a year, Alexander died and was succeeded by John XXIII. Only Spain and Scotland now adhered to Benedict, and a few places in the States of the Church acknowledged Gregory. John, pursuant to a decree of the assembly of Pisa, summoned a general council to be held at Rome in April, 1412, to reform the discipline of the Church; but as Ladislas, king of Naples, then besieged the city of Rome, the council could not be held; peace, however, being made in the month of June, John was left for some time in quiet possession of the city and see. Ladislas however, in June, 1413, got into the city by night with his troops, without any previous notice, and committed horrible excesses. John escaped to Florence, and besought the aid of the Emperor Sigismond, with whom he also consulted about assembling a council, leaving it to the Emperor to fix upon the place. Constance was selected, greatly to the mortification of John, who however issued the bull for convocation. On the 5th of November, 1414, the council was opened in the Cathedral of Constance, John himself presiding. Several serious charges of misconduct being brought against the Pope, and the deputies of Benedict and Gregory being present, it was determined to require the resignation of John and the submission of the other two. At the second session on the 2d of March, 1415, John promised to resign, if it would tend to the peace of the Church. In the course of that month he withdrew from Constance, and retired to Schaffhausen, which was held by his friend Frederick, Duke of Austria; thence he retired to Lauffemberg, and afterwards to Friburg. He was required by the council to resign, but he eluding the request, they summoned him to answer upon an appointed day, the charges preferred against him for bad conduct. On the 13th of May, twenty-three commissioners were appointed to hear and report the testimony against John, who was again summoned to answer; this was the

ninth session; the charges contained in the articles of impeachment amounted to seventy. In the tenth session the commissioners reported them proved, the report was received and adopted, and the Pope was suspended by the council: this being notified to him, he acquiesced. He was now in the vicinity of Constance, and sent the fisherman's ring to the council by those who were sent to demand it. In the eleventh session it was determined that he should be deposed, and he having acquiesced, on the 29th of May, in the twelfth session, the sentence of deposition was pronounced, and his seal broken; five Cardinals were deputed to communicate to him these proceedings; after about two hours reflection he fully acquiesced, and the proclamation of the fact was published by the council. Gregory XII sent his resignation to the Emperor, which was received from him by the council in the fourteenth session on the 4th of July. Benedict XIII, at Avignon, still claimed the title of Pope, and Sigismond left Constance to try and induce him to lay aside the name; he could not prevail upon the unfortunate old man to accede, notwithstanding the entreaties of the ambassadors of Castile, Navarre, and Scotland, the only nations which yet continued to hold to his cause; the Emperor agreed at Narbonne, upon certain terms which were called a capitulation with those ambassadors, and these articles were approved of by the council; the object of the capitulation was principally to proceed to examine the case of Benedict at Constance, as if nothing had been done at Pisa, so as to save the honor of those who were now his adherents; Spain thereupon withdrew from the old man and joined the council: the process against this obstinate prelate was entered upon, but it was only in the thirty-seventh session which was held on the 26th of July, 1417, that sentence of deposition was pronounced. The council continued its sessions, and on the 11th of November, Otho of Colonna, a Cardinal Deacon, was elected Pope, he taking the name of Martin V. The council was dismissed on the 22nd of April 1418, and the schism closed; though Benedict lived till 1424, and made two Cardinals who adhered to him promise as soon as they should have interred his body to elect an opponent to Martin V; they were also urged to this by Alphonsus, King of Arragon, who had quarrelled with Martin: and yielding to this bad advice they chose Gilles Mugnos, a Spanish Doctor of Laws. This poor man was compelled by Alphonsus to wear the Pontifical dress and permit people to address him as Clement VIII; but the king having been reconciled to the Pope, Mugnos received his majesty's directions to discontinue the farce: having sent a formal resignation of the Popedom, he declared the See vacant, joined his two

Cardinals in Conclave and they unanimously elected Otho Colonna now named Martin V. Thus in the year 1429 ended the great schism.

We have before seen that during the entire period there was no difference of doctrine, and now we see that whether Urban VI was or was not canonically elected, the full authority of the successor of Peter merged in Martin V.

If we calmly view the facts of this great schism, we will observe in the first place that throughout the whole period there was a perfect unity of faith, for no one division denied any article which the other held to have been revealed by our blessed Saviour. Next, if we examine the facts as presented to us, we will be led to believe that the great majority of Christendom adhered to Urban VII, and consequently that Robert, who took the name of Clement VII, and his successor Peter de Luna, called Benedict XIII. were schismatics, as was also the poor instrument Gilles Mugnos, called Clement VIII; [and] of course the succession will be found in Urban VI, Boniface IX, Innocent VII, and Gregory XII. If it be admitted that the council of Pisa represented the general body of the Church, and had authority to depose the Pope for mal-administration, Gregory being deposed, the succession proceeds through Alexander V, and John XXIII, to Martin V, who is acknowledged by the whole Church, through its representatives at Constance, as well as by the cession of all the others in his favor: so that the unity of faith was never lost: there was no deviation from the unity of agreement as to the nature of the Church government: nor can a question be raised as to the full right of Martin V to be the supreme pastor of that Church.

Martin V summoned a general council to assemble at Basil, but died before its meeting: his death occurred in Rome on the 28th of February, 1431, and on the first of March the Cardinals entered into Conclave, and chose Eugenius IV, who repeated the summons of the council; confirming also the appointment of Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, a most excellent man whom his predecessor had named to preside as his legate.

I shall in my next lay before you the history of what White calls the installation of Felix V, and the deposition of Eugenius IV, in which you will still perceive that the unity of faith and principles of government, that is, the constitution of the Church, were preserved unchanged, and the succession unbroken. Thus, even in the most disastrous period of the Church, there was not amongst Catholics that variance of doctrine and of government, which we believe to be incompatible with the unity of the Church. There were disputes and perhaps serious temporary doubts as to which of two individuals was the depository of a power

whose institution, necessity, continuance and existence were firmly believed. There was no difference of doctrine, but there was doubt respecting an important fact.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER LIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 28, 1828.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—White's object in the paragraph under examination is to lead his readers into the belief that at the period of the great schism there was in the Roman Catholic Church a similar variance to that which exists between Protestant sects: he endeavors to show the continuance of that variation during the papacy of Eugenius IV, by insinuating that a difference of doctrine existed between him and a general council, which he by mistake calls that of Constance, and that two general councils, viz. that of Basil and that of Ferrara, opposed each other in doctrine.

It is to exhibit fully and clearly to you the baseless assertions of this man and his patrons that I enter so much into detail, because a knowledge of the facts will dissipate the illusion which he labors to create. I shall therefore lay before you the history of this contest.

Eugenius having summoned the council to meet at Basil, and having appointed Cardinal Julian as its president, soon perceived reason to doubt whether the city which had been selected was the most proper for the meeting. The council was opened on the 23d of July, 1431: towards the close of that year, and before any business had been matured, the Pope wrote to his deputy, Cardinal Julian, informing him of his wish to have a translation of the council to another city; Julian, however, continued the sessions in Basil; the Emperor of Germany and King of France were particularly opposed to any removal; and nearly a year passed in the endeavors of each side to obtain the accession of the other, the majority of the Bishops being with the Emperor and the King, and the minority with the Pope. Eugenius issued a bull dissolving the council at Basil, and summoning the prelates to meet at Bologna, but the majority of the prelates having voted against the translation, the meeting still continued at Basil. It is not until the close of the year 1433 that Eugenius revoked the bull and sent two other legates to preside with Julian at Basil. The Pope was greatly displeased at some regulations which were made concerning the revenue of the

Holy See, and the administration of the Court of Rome, and refused to sanction them with his assent. Meantime, in consequence of a sedition at Rome, the Pope was obliged to take refuge in Florence.

The Greek Emperor John Paleologus, and the Patriarch of Constantinople, sent ambassadors to Basil for the purpose of procuring a meeting between the prelates of both Churches, in order to a reconciliation: the Latins invited them to Basil, but the Greeks prefered some Italian city near the coast, to which the persons who had hitherto kept the sessions at Basil would not accede. The council proceeded to encroach still farther upon the revenues of the papacy by the abolition of first fruits, to which Eugenius replied that he would give his consent to those abolitions, provided the Bishops would show how the See of Rome could be otherwise supported; meantime he refused his assent. The Greeks became urgent for a meeting at some other place, and at length the fathers at Basil consented upon certain conditions, that if the other parties agreed, they would translate their sessions to Avignon. The foundation of re-union had already been laid between Eugenius and the Greeks in several conferences, but they required the assent of the Latin prelates, and neither the Pope nor the Easterns wished to go to either Basil or Avignon. The Bohemians had been called to Basil for the regulation of their differences, and this was urged as a reason for continuing in that city; the Pope's legates replied that the business of the Bohemians might be terminated at Basil, and then an adjournment might be made to meet the Greeks at Bologna or Udina: but this would not satisfy the majority. In the next session, a large number voted for a translation of the council to Avignon; a lesser number, with the legates, voted to discontinue the sessions at Basil, and to meet where the Pope would appoint for the Greeks. Eugenius declared the council of Basil dissolved, and convoked the fathers to meet the Greeks at Ferrara; allowing, however, the business of the Bohemians to be concluded at Basil. The bull containing this declaration was dated on the 1st of October, 1437. On the 23d of December, such of the prelates as remained at Basil having summoned Eugenius to answer charges which they drew up, and he not appearing, they pronounced sentence of suspension against him. Of the value of this sentence it is easy to judge. As the Pope undertook to pay the expenses of the Greek deputies, he wanted money, and intended to sell Avignon: the indignation with which this was received at Basil, and the opposition which it experienced, shows pretty clearly that the old desire of having the Pope under the influence of the air of Avignon, was still one of the ingredients of the opposition.

On the 8th of January, 1438, the Cardinal of the Holy Cross, by the Pope's authority, opened the council at Ferrara. The Cardinal Julian and the other legates had now withdrawn from Basil and joined the Pope; few of the Bishops, however, had as yet arrived at the new council, because the Emperor of the West, and other secular princes, prevented their leaving Basil. Charles VII, King of France, particularly denounced the severest punishment against any French Bishop who should go to Ferrara. Eugenius arrived there on the 27th of January, and presided at a congregation which was held on the 8th of February, and at the second session which was held on the 15th of that month; the Greek Emperor arrived on the 4th of March, and three days afterwards the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Greek deputies entered Ferrara, and were introduced to the Pope.

On the 14th of March, the prelates who remained at Basil, and who, after the departure of the legates, had chosen as their president Cardinal Aleman, Archbishop of Arles in France, protested against the authority of the council of Ferrara. Henceforth they were gradually diminishing in numbers and proceeding in a mock trial of the Pope, during the remainder of that year.

Having made several preliminary regulations, subsequently to the arrival of the Greeks, for the more minute discussion of the points of difference, the sessions were adjourned for six months; during which the several points were debated thrice every week, the speakers on the side of the Greeks being Mark of Ephesus and Bessarion of Nice; and on the side of the Latins, Cardinal Julian and Cardinal de Ferrara. The first session of the united Greeks and Latins was held on Wednesday, the 8th of October; the sessions continued until the 10th of the succeeding January; when upon the breaking out of sickness at Ferrara, at the request of the Florentines, and their engagement to pay the expenses of the Greeks, the council was, upon the suggestion of the Pope, transferred to Florence; at which [city] the first session was held on the 26th of February, 1439. The conferences and sessions continued and the articles of Union were nearly complete, when on the 9th of June, Joseph, the venerable Patriarch of Constantinople, who, during twenty-three years, had filled that See, died at Florence, having been fully reconciled to the Pope, whom he acknowledged to be the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Jesus Christ, and the head of the Universal Church. On the 25th of June, the re-union of the Greeks and Latins was subsequently concluded at Florence; and on the same day the good prelates who remained at Basil, pronounced sentence of deposition against Eugenius. On the 6th of July, the last session was held at

Florence, in which both Greeks and Latins united and subscribed the articles of re-union.

Contrary to the entreaties of the Western Emperor, and of others who still adhered to them, the prelates of Basil proceeded to elect a person to fill what they called the vacant See, and Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, who, after the death of his wife, lived in a splendid sort of religious retirement, was chosen, and consecrated by the Cardinal of Arles; this anti-pope assumed the name of Felix V. Eugenius admonished the retired duke to lay down his pretentions, under pain of excommunication to him and his adherents.

The prelates at Basil excommunicated Eugenius and his adherents.

Very few even of those who adhered to the council of Basil treated Felix as Pope. His son Louis, Duke of Savoy, and some others of the Swiss, were almost his only adherents. The few clergymen, for there was now scarcely a bishop remaining, who were at Basil, adjourned their council in May, 1443, to meet again at Lyons, in France, at the end of three years; but they did not meet. Eugenius died in 1447, and was succeeded by Nicholas V, whom the Catholic world acknowledged, and to whom Felix himself submitted two years afterwards, bitterly lamenting his erroneous proceedings; and thus was this schism concluded.

I have thus laid before you the statement of facts, and I ask whether this unfortunate schism was a difference of doctrine: and whether the succession of the Apostolic See was lost? Was this such a difference as exists between Baptists and Methodists? Mark White's conclusion:

"And now, I will ask, is this the unity, the harmony, without which your writers contend that the Church of Christ cannot exist? Is it thus that the necessity of your interpretation of the Scripture passages, on which the system of infallibility has been erected, is sanctioned by experience? Can you still close your eyes against the demonstration contained in my preceding letter, because variations and dissent are in the train of its consequences?"

I answer; this, unfortunately, is not unity of charity, it is not unity of peace, and harmony of brethren, but there is not here any want of unity of doctrine; there is here still to be found that unity of principle which, properly applied to facts, will in time produce unity of affection and harmony of action. Here there are excited passions, embittered opposition, but an adherence to the great doctrine of the unity of the Church, and the necessity of preserving unchanged the despotism of faith and the constitution of the government, and because this was preserved the troubled ocean became calm, discord ceased, and when passion subsided schism was extinguished.

The contention was not about the correct interpretation of passages of the Holy Scripture, nor about [the question] whether Christ revealed a particular doctrine, nor concerning the truth of a moral principle, nor even regarding a doctrinal fact: upon those subjects we believe the judgment of the Church to be infallibly correct. But the question was one of easy solution, though rendered difficult by the circumstances with which it was entangled: it was not in any manner a question of faith. If White showed us two contradictory propositions of doctrine or of morals taught by the same, or by different general councils, indeed our principle must yield.

Viewing this in its most unfavorable light, we should say that supposing the majority of Bishops to have been at Basil, and the minority with the Pope at Florence, and both to have been in contradiction, neither would be infallible, because the tribunal which we believe to be gifted by heaven with that prerogative, must consist of the Pope and the majority of the Bishops in full accord. What would be said to the witling who should give us this sapient argument? "You say that your laws must be assented to by the President and a majority of the House of Representatives, and a majority of the Senate. But a majority of the representatives passed a bill of which the President disapproved, and after the constitutional close of the session, the representatives still continue in session; the President, with the advice of the Senate, reprimands them for this violation of custom and usage; and they declare that the President has lost his power, and proceed to declare him deposed, and the Senate to be traitors. Now, unless you acknowledge that he is constitutionally deposed, that the person whom they have chosen and whom the Senate rejects and condemns, is the true constitutional President, you can never prove that Congress has power to pass a law; for to pass a law, the House of Representatives must have power, but if you deny their power in this case, you deny their power altogether, and if they have no power, are you not wrong in observing any law enacted by the Congress?" Just such an argument as this, those wise and learned gentlemen who support White, use against us. Judge you of its value.

I trust that you plainly perceive that even in this most afflicting state of the Church, there was no deviation from faith, no denial of the Papal supremacy, no change of the principles of Church government, no loss of the succession, and that they who differed as to facts agreed in doctrine.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER LIV.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 4, 1828.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Having seen the nature of the divisions by which the Church was unfortunately rent at the time of the great schism, and at the period of the Council of Florence; it is now clear that on neither occasion was there any diversity of doctrinal belief amongst its members, consequently there was perfect unity of faith. White having endeavored to play upon the differences, and to insinuate a diversity of belief which he dared not assert, proceeds as if to answer our defence. In his page 105, and so forth, we have the following passage:

"'Our troubles and dissensions, however, (you are taught to answer) are limited to externals; those of the Protestants affect the unity of the faith.' Such is the last shelter, the citadel, of your infallible Church theory. See, then, the series of assumptions, doubts and evasions of which that theory consists, and observe its inevitable consequences. 1. You assume that which is in question, the necessity of an infallible judge of faith. 2. Upon the strength of that assumption, you interpret certain passages of the Scripture, so that they are made to prove the existence of such a judge. 3. You are then in doubt as to the identity of the judge himself, without being able to determine by any fixed rule, whether the supernatural gift of infallibility belongs to the Pope alone, or to the Pope and the general council. 4. When to evade this difficulty, you avail yourselves of the term Church, as embracing the privileges of the Pope and council; you are still obliged to contrive another method, which may meet the objections arising from such dissensions between the assembled bishops and their head, as took place in the instances above mentioned. This you do by allowing no council to be infallible till it has been approved by the Pope, and thus resolve Church infallibility into the opinion of the Roman See. 5. And finally, You intrench yourselves within the distinction of infallibility on abstract doctrines of faith, and liability to practical error. Now, observe, I entreat you, the consequences to which the whole system leads. The only sensible mark of a legitimate council, being the approbation of the Pope; and the only sensible mark of a legitimate Pope, being his undisputed possession of the See of Rome; you have, in the first place, entailed the gift of the infallibility upon the strongest of the rival candidates for that see; and, as moral worth is, by the last distinction, denied to be a necessary characteristic of the vicar and representative of Christ, you have added, in the second place, one chance

more of having for your living rule of faith that candidate who shall contend for the visible badge of his spiritual and supernatural office, under the least restraint of moral obligation. If we find, therefore, upon consulting the history of the Popes, that no Episcopal See has oftener been polluted by wickedness and profligacy, the fact is explained by the preceding statement. What chance of success to be head of the Christian Church could attend a true disciple of Jesus Christ, when a Borgia was bent upon filling that post? Gold, steel and poison, were the familiar instruments of his wishes; whilst the belief that faith was still safe in the custody of such a monster, prevented opposition from the force of public opinion. The faithful still revered in Alexander VI, (be the blasphemy far from me!) the true representative of Christ on earth."

It is not easy to know what he would be at in this place. If he means to prove want of unity in our Church, as would seem to be his object in the first lines: he makes no reply to what he gives as our answer. But from what follows he appears rather to turn again upon infallibility, which indeed must ever be a thorn in the side of every innovator.

Let us see those "assumptions, doubts and evasions," of which he so magisterially disposes. "You assume that which is in question, the necessity of an infallible judge of faith." Indeed we do not, but we prove it by a very simple process: such as the following: "Faith is the belief of what God has taught." "We cannot believe what he has taught, without certainly knowing what it is." "We cannot know with certainty what God has taught except from a witness which can neither deceive us nor be deceived herself respecting what has been revealed by God." "A witness of that description is infallible." "Therefore, in order to have faith we find it necessary to have a judge of faith whose judicial testimony will be infallibly correct." White is kind enough to inform us that "there are but few, indeed, who can take a second true step in reasoning." I trust I shall not be considered arrogant in believing that I have here taken three or four true steps, and that I have demonstrated what White so flippantly says we assume. I shall try another process for the same conclusion. "Any testimony which is not infallibly correct might lead me to error." "If the Church be not an infallibly correct witness, I can never be certain that she will teach me the doctrine of Christ;" "Neither am I myself infallible," "nor is any other individual or collection of individuals infallible." "Thus I cannot be certain of knowing the doctrine of Christ from the Church, from my own opinion of the Scriptures, nor from the opinion of any other

individual or collection of individuals."—"Therefore I have no mode of being certain that I know the doctrine of Christ, and since I cannot believe with perfect certainty what I cannot know with perfect certainty; and since certain belief is absolutely required for Faith, it is impossible for me to have Faith." So much for what he calls our "assuming that which is in question."

"2. Upon the strength of that assumption, we interpret certain passages of Scripture, so that they are made to prove the existence of such a judge." Then if the existence of this judge is proved by the interpretation of texts of Scripture, and every person is privileged to interpret the texts of Scripture according to his own opinion, why is Mr. White so inconsistent with himself, as to call our doctrine unscriptural? Do we not prove it according to his own principles from the Scriptures themselves? But what he insinuates here is in plain terms an untruth, because we do not assume the truth of the question, but we prove the truth of the position. Nor is it because even of this proof that we do so interpret those texts, which, by the way, he has taken good care to omit, but we interpret them thus, because from the beginning they had been interpreted so by the companions and the disciples of the inspired penmen, and by their successors in every intervening age.

"3. You are then in doubt as to the identity of the judge himself, without being able to determine by any fixed rule, whether the supernatural gift of infallibility belongs to the Pope alone, or to the Pope and the general council."

This is also an untruth. It is painful to be under the necessity of using such language, but when a writer is so far lost to principle and to shame as to make such gross and palpable misstatements, there is no other phraseology which will express the character of his production. The rule is fixed, and plain, the judge is the supreme tribunal of the Church, and the Church is not the head without the members, nor the members without the head, but both united. The note which he appends to this assertion is but an extension of the misrepresentation.

Uncertainty of Roman Catholic Infallibility:

"Nothing can be more certain than the uncertainty of the Roman Catholic Church, as to the seat and source of her pretended infallibility. If any thing can be deduced from the vague and unsettled principles of her divines, on this subject, it would appear that infallibility finally resolves itself into the authority of the Pope. For, as no council whatever is deemed infallible till the Pope has sanctioned its decrees, the pretended assistance from Heaven must apply to that discriminating

oracle, on whose decision the supernatural authority of the council depends.

"The opening speech of the papal legates who presided at the council of Trent represents the expected inspiration as conditional; a very natural caution in the representatives of that see, which has always most strenuously opposed the notion that the Pope is inferior to a general council. After a candid acknowledgement of the erroneous corruptions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, which the reader will find hereafter, the legates speak of the expected inspiration in the following words:—

Quare nisi ille spiritus nos apud nosmetipsos primum condemnaverit, nondum illum ingressum esse ad nos affimare possumus, ac ne ingressurum quidem, si peccata nostra audire recusamus. Idem enim dicetur nobis, quod populo veteri per prophetam Ezechielam est dictum, cum nondum agnitis suis sceleribus. Dominum per prophetam interrogare vellent, Venerunt viri Israel ad interrogandum Dominum, et sederunt coram me. Hoec autem dicit Dominus: numquid ad interrogandum me venistis? Vivo ego, dicit Dominus, quia non respondebo vobis. Sequitur autem, si judicas eos, abominationes patrum illorum ostende illis. In quibus verbis ostendit Deus, quare noluerit respondere illis, quia nondum scilicet abominationes suas et patrum suorum audierant. Quare cum idem Dei Spiritus sit, qui tunc debat responsa, et quem nunc nos sedentes coram Domino invocamus, quid nobis faciendum sit, ut propria responsa habeamus, ex his videtis.....Quia vero nonnullos nunc videmus, sua primum peccata, et nostri ordinis graviter deflentes, atque Dei misericordiam omnibus votis implorantes, ideo quidem in maxima spe sumus, advenisse, quem invocamus, Dei Spiritum.—Concilia per Labbeum et Gossartium, Tom. xiv, p. 738.

"It is clear that the legates grounded their hopes of inspiration for the Council, on the marks of repentance which they perceived in some of its members. Must then Roman Catholics ascertain the spiritual condition of their oracles, before they admit them to the privilege of infallibility? It should seem, however, that the Popes are not subject to such restrictions in the use of their infallible sanction; else, a man with the moral tact of Alexander VI, would have been subject to strange mistakes, in calculating the fitness of the bishops in council, to receive an inspiration totally dependent on moral character."

I have frequently before exhibited the sophistry of this man by applying his terms to our civil institutions. Allow me to use this method with the first paragraph of his note.

If any thing can be deduced from the vague and unsettled prin-

ciples of American writers on the powers of Congress, it would appear that the legislative authority resolves itself finally into the authority of the President, so that the law is an emanation from him only. For as no legislative acts of the majority of the Senate and House of Representatives are deemed binding until they have been sanctioned by the President, whatever might be said in their courts, or written in their books asserting that the legislative authority resides in the Congress which consists of both houses and the President, must in fact be applied to the President alone, because it is by his authority the acts become laws and are carried into execution."

All this flimsy sophistry would be destroyed by the simple fact, that, if the President were to attempt to make a law without the concurrence of the majority in both houses, the attempt would be futile, and none would feel himself called on to obey. In like manner, if the Pope were to issue a decision, from which the majority of the Bishops were to dissent, or to which they refused their concurrence, such decision would not be an act of the Church, and of course would not bind persons to obedience.

The latter portion of this note is, if possible, a more despicable piece of deceit. The "candid acknowledgement of the enormous corruptions of the Roman Catholic Clergy," is grossly exaggerated by the writer; but what were the corruptions? A change of faith—a corruption of doctrine? By no means. The legates who candidly avow the misconduct of several of the clergy, proclaim with the same voice the pure preservation of the doctrine of the Church. Nor was the misconduct of the clergy so enormous, nor were their corruptions of morals so great or so general, as were those of the self-called reformers: although there had been grievous crimes committed by several Roman Catholic clergymen, yet the great majority of the body were men of virtue, and several were eminent for the most edifying sanctity.

It is also falsely suggested, that, because the legates exhorted the members of the council to repentance and virtue, as one mode of obtaining the blessing of heaven to lead them to truth, prudence, and knowledge; that they were, therefore, doubtful as to whether the Pope and Council were infallible. But here I cannot repress my astonishment at the inconsistency of White, who is charging our Church with arrogance, in alleging that the Pope and Council will give an infallibly true judgment upon doctrine, and yet in the very passage attempts to show that we do not hold the tenet which he condemns us for holding! ! ! It might be as well to translate the passage which he quotes and garbles: but even as it is, it will not establish his conclusion:

"Wherefore, unless that Spirit will first have led us to self-condemnation, we cannot affirm that he hath as yet entered unto us, nor indeed that he will enter, if we refuse to hear the voice of our sins. It will be said to us as it was said to the people of old by the prophet Ezekiel, when not having as yet acknowledged their sins, they desired to ask the Lord by the prophet:—'The men of Israel came to ask of the Lord, and they sat before me. But thus saith the Lord: have you come to inquire of me? As I live, saith the Lord, I will not answer you. It followeth: if thou judgest them, show unto them the abominations of their fathers.' In which words the Lord showeth why he would not answer them; because, to wit, since it is the same Spirit of God who then used to give answer, and also we now invoke, being seated before the Lord; you see from those things what we ought to do, that we might have proper answers. . . . . And since we now behold some bewailing, first their own sins, and those of our order, and imploring by all mode of prayers the mercy of God, therefore we are in the greatest confidence that the Spirit of God which we invoke hath come amongst us."

Such is the passage upon which this man founds his assertion, that "the legates grounded their hopes of inspiration for the council, on the marks of repentance which they perceived in some of its members." If the prelates are bad men, the Holy Ghost, he says, cannot guide them; though St. John says, he guided the wicked high priest of the Jews to a correct decision, because of the office which he held; and if they are good men, it is only a doubt that they will be guided. White does not like the guidance at all. But the ground of the confidence of the legates was not founded in this passage, which was only an exhortation to virtue, but in those passages in which they referred to the express and distinct promises of Christ. Such as that of Pope Paul, in his bull for assembling the Council, *ut cum illic in nomine Domini essemus congregati; ipse sicut promisit Dominus in medio nostrum efuturus*, "that when we would be gathered in the name of the Lord, the Lord himself, as he promised, would be in the midst of us." Thus it is untrue to say, that Catholics are unable to determine where infallibility resides, as it is also untrue to say that we must know the virtue of the Bishops, before we can know if their tribunal is properly constituted. We depend upon the promises of Christ, and not upon the virtue of the Bishops.

The futility of the fourth proposition has been so amply exhibited in what I have previously written that I shall not take it up again.

The fifth and final observation which he makes is an aggregate of untruths. First, it is untrue that "the only sensible mark of a legitimate

council is the approbation of the Pope." Its legitimacy may be recognised by a variety of other sensible marks, of which I shall instance merely two. It might be recognised by the very view: as in case there was an actual majority of the prelates of the Church present, acting in harmony and with full liberty; it might be recognised by the sequel: as in case of the presence of only a minority but the approbation and adoption of their acts by the great body of the absent prelates. Suppose the See of Rome vacant in the first instance, the legitimacy of the council would be known, and yet there would have been then no Papal approbation. The next untruth is, that the mere undisputed possession of the See of Rome is the only sensible mark of the legitimacy of the Pope. The third untruth is to assert that infallibility is according to Catholic tenets entailed upon that candidate who obtains such possession. The fourth untruth is, that no see has been oftener polluted by profligacy and wickedness than the See of Rome. The fifth is, that the Pope is our living rule of faith. When nonsense like this is put into our mouths by those who, at least, ought to know that they bear false witnesses against us, we are indeed made to appear ridiculous: but, I trust, it may without irreverence be said, that the spouse of Christ then resembles the Saviour, when clothed in the garment of a fool; he lost none of his wisdom, but the scoffer greatly increased his own criminality. Catholics have no living rule, but they have a living tribunal; a living judge, but that tribunal of judgment is the Church; and that Church is not merely its head or chief pastor, but it is the head and other pastors united.

White affects to ridicule the distinction between infallibility and impeccability. Though we are not called upon by our tenet to look upon the Pope as either impeccable or infallible, yet we can conceive the ground of the distinction, and it was taught us by the Saviour, when he told his hearers that the Scribes and Pharisees sat upon the chair of Moses, to do according to their words, but not according to their works. Fortified by such an admonition from such a source, we can read the commencement of the next paragraph with which we are favored, with pity for the pride and arrogance of those who vilify the teaching of the Son of God, page 108:

"The strength of mind which enables the reformers to disregard the generally received distinction between exemption from doctrinal errors, and liability to misconduct, cannot be adequately valued by those who have never imbibed that scholastic prejudice."

White had previously boasted of his ignorance of scholastic knowledge, but really I was not prepared to learn that he would disregard

and despise it even in the Gospel, and coming from the lips of the blessed Jesus. It might, for aught that I know, be strength of mind; but, if so, it is of that description for the humiliation of which St. Paul says the wisdom of heaven was given in what appeared to be human folly. It reminds me of the simpleton whom I once heard boast of his strength of mind, declaring that he could never be so stupid as to understand the use of mathematics, or throw away his time in learning how to make an equilateral triangle; and he, in the sincerity of his heart thanked God for giving him so clear an intellect as to be unable even to comprehend the demonstration of how it might be done.

I shall only adduce one favorite fact from amongst those on which the gentry, whose modesty and strength of mind urges them to take the title of reformers, are in the habit of dwelling. Peter was a sinner, yet the epistles of Peter are according to those strong-minded folk infallible evidence of the revelation of heaven: thus infallibility and peccability are compatible; or to use White's own phrase, the strong-minded gentry admit in St. Peter's case "the distinction of infallibility on abstract doctrines of faith, and liability to practical error." The consequences drawn against us, if legitimate, from the admission of the distinction, are equally fatal to themselves; but they affect neither, because they are not contained in the premises.

The dishonesty of the writer is again exhibited in the assertion, that Alexander VI was not opposed, because of the belief that faith was safe in his custody, though he was a monster. The custody or guardianship of the faith was not in Alexander VI, but in that Church of which he was the unworthy head; and in that Church, even under his Papacy, there were hundreds of holy Bishops, tens-of-thousands of venerable priests, and millions of saints. But it is folly to attempt the correction of all the untruths of such a book as White's.

I shall conclude this letter with the remark, that it is upon the presiding influence of the Holy Ghost, upon the promises of our blessed Redeemer, and upon the mighty power of God, and not upon the vice or virtue of the Prelates of the Church, that Roman Catholics rely for having in that Church always the infallible testimony of truth. Hence, all the semblance of argument which is used to show how weak a foundation is the imperfection of man, is wide of the question which is raised; and as the Church, and not the Pope, is the tribunal, so the arguments against the sufficiency of the Pope make nothing against the sufficiency of the Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, according to the promises of Jesus Christ, and from the very nature of faith itself.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER LV.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 19, 1828.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—The succeeding paragraphs of White's book are perhaps as far below the criticism of a philosopher as they are distant from truth in their assertions of fact. I shall lay them before you, making upon each some of those remarks which must strike even the least instructed amongst you.

"The strength of mind which enabled the reformers to disregard the generally received distinction between exemption from doctrinal errors, and liability to misconduct, cannot be adequately valued by those who have never imbibed that scholastic prejudice. When a distinction of this kind has once become incorporated with common language, men seem to be placed out of the reach of conviction on the points its affects. If my observation of intellectual phenomena do not deceive me, the mass of those who may be said to think at all can go no farther in a reasoning process, than just to perceive one difficulty against their settled notions, and to catch some verbal quibble which removes the difficulty from their sight. The process of examining the usual fallacies of such answers is, to most men, so painful, that any serious attempt to urge them upon it, seldom fails to rouse their anger. There are, indeed, but few who can take a true second step in reasoning."

To disregard a distinction founded upon a difference might perhaps accompany strength of mind, but such recklessness of truth is also found in weak and vicious minds, hence the disregard of a generally received maxim founded upon common reason, consecrated by the Saviour, and upheld by the testimony of successive centuries of the learned, the wise, and the good throughout Christendom, does not establish for the Reformers, as they are pleased to style themselves, strength of mind so much as the rejection of truth. And surely it needs no depth of research to discover that testimony of truth might be certainly given by an immoral person. Yet as I before stated, our doctrine needs not this aid, because we do not teach as an article of faith the personal infallibility nor the official infallibility of a bad or of a good Pope. The entire paragraph is based upon the false assumption that we teach what we disclaim. It is also untrue that the distinction is a scholastic prejudice.

If we have no infallible guide to truth; if "those who may be said to think at all can go no farther in a reasoning process than just to perceive one difficulty against their settled notions, and to catch some

verbal quibble which removes the difficulty from their sight," and if "there are but few who can take a true second step in reasoning," the inevitable result must be that "the mass of those who may be said to think at all," together with all those who may be said not to think at all; that is, the great bulk of Christendom, must be unable to examine the fallacies by which error is disseminated, and being without a certain guide, must be without any certain knowledge of truth, and they who are bereft of the certain knowledge of truth can have no rational ground for firm belief; it is manifest therefore that they can have no faith, since that virtue is the firm belief of certain truth revealed by God. To this conclusion every Protestant must inevitably come, according to the theory of this man, who proclaims to the world the imbecility of the human mind, and exhibits to us the incongruous theory of a just and merciful and wise God, requiring that we should firmly believe what we cannot certainly know. He leaves to us however, as we shall see, an alternative, but it is not that of unchangeable doctrine and belief, but of complete uncertainty.

"The stand which is generally made at the first stage of an argument, is more resolutely taken when arguments are brought against a system which is itself a palliative of some previous objection. The case now before us is perhaps the best illustration of my view of popular intellect.

"Christianity was at an early period systematized according to the notions and habits which some of its learned converts had acquired in the philosophical schools. It was soon presented to the world in the shape of a new theory, where the links which appeared to be wanting between the clearly revealed doctrines were supplied by the ingenuity of inference. Nothing, we know, is so opposed to this vulgar systematic spirit as taking facts as they are. The chasm between what is, and an assumed standard of what should be, must be filled up. Few men refuse to grant what is demanded with this object; for fragments of real knowledge are not to the taste of the multitude. Having agreed that the Gospel was a revelation from God, they could not conceive the possibility of doubt affecting it directly or indirectly. Optimism is the system of the many: a revelation which could not remove every doubt, and silence every objection, must certainly fail to suit their previous notions."

There is indeed a very curious but fallacious exhibition of the origin of our religion, and in the contemplation of which, I can scarcely know [whether] to be amused with the vain effort to elude the difficulty which pressed upon the writer, or be disgusted with the bold attempt to sap the foundations of faith for the purpose of an escape

from its restraints. What a series of assertions does this passage contain! First, that the first Christians actually destroyed the simplicity of religious belief by substituting a system of learned philosophy or paganism for the doctrine of our Saviour. If such was the fact, then indeed the Christian religion was never spread through the world. And, for what purpose did Christ come upon this earth? How mean and contemptible a notion must we have of the power of God, of the force of truth, of the testimony of the Apostles, of the evidence of miracles, of the providence of our merciful instructor! And will not the solemn prophetic and promissory declaration of Christ respecting the continuance and stability of his Church, be blasphemously contradicted by those who would maintain this position: that the first learned Christians changed the revelation of heaven into a system of pagan philosophical notions and habits! ! ! By this process White has changed the early witnesses of faith into its worst enemies. If the doctrines of Christianity were then lost, how have they been since acquired? By the reading of the New Testament? But how shall we be assured that they who corrupted the doctrine and the rituals did not also corrupt the Gospels and the Epistles? Suppose the Scriptures to be pure, how shall we be assured, that we who live several centuries later than the period in which they were written, understand their meaning better than did those learned converts, who lived in and immediately after the days of the Apostles, and around whom the evidence of still more brilliant miracles yet shed the effulgence of heavenly light? Have the Justins, the Irenæuses, the Dionysiuses, the Cyprians, the Clements, and the Tertullians erred, and corrupted Christianity, and has its purity been restored by the Luthers, the Cranmers, the Calvins, the Cromwells, the Henrys, the Socinuses, the Priestlys, the Hoadlys, and the Whites? If we look to history we shall indeed discover that in the early days of the Church some of its converts did endeavor to accommodate the doctrines of Christ to the systems of philosophy, but the names of those innovators, and the result of their efforts are also placed before us. They were the Ebions, the Cerinthuses, the Marcions, and such others, who for this unholy and sacrilegious effort were condemned by the Christian Church, and being separated from its communion, formed conventicles apart; declared that it was spiritual tyranny to compel them to conform to a standard of belief; that they would not destroy their liberty by submitting to the authority of men, and that they were to interpret the sacred writings by their own private judgment, and not to receive the decisions of a public body; in a word, they were the first heretics, whose errors assume new shapes in their transmigrations

through succeeding ages, but have always the same spiritual characteristics: overweening pride, incorrigible obstinacy, arrogant self-esteem, insolent opposition, and glaring inconsistency.

Second assertion, that Christianity was an aggregate of clearly revealed doctrines without any mutual connexion. This is highly complimentary to the divine wisdom indeed! So that upon White's theory, the Almighty in his wisdom does what we would call folly in a human being. Suppose an adversary of religion to reason thus, what would be said to his argument? "You acknowledge that God is wise, and intended by revelation to instruct you upon a subject of vast importance, and respecting which you were extremely ignorant: you say, that in order to effect this he clearly revealed some isolated propositions between which there existed no mutual connexion, you say that it is unlawful for you to 'fill up' 'the chasm,' but that you should be satisfied with 'fragments of real knowledge,' however destitute of system. Call you this revelation? Is it not rather a bewildering?" For my part I must avow that if this was the basis of Christianity, I know not how I could be a Christian. The fact is in opposition to White's assertion, because it has been always an acknowledged point that the revelation of Christ was a perfect and connected whole, and not disjointed and separate doctrines: it was avowed to be the manifestation of the work of the Deity, and that it showed forth his power and his mercy, and was in unity as to its parts, and in unison with the perfections of its author. It is not true, then, that the ingenuity of inference supplied the links which appeared to be wanting between the clearly revealed doctrines. The principle of Protestantism, which asserts that nothing has been clearly revealed but what is exactly written in the Scriptures, renders it absolutely necessary to supply much by inference to fill up chasms: but the principle of Catholicism, which says that there exists no chasms, leaves nothing to supply. The Catholic says that some of the doctrines of revelation are found in the Scriptures, and others are exhibited by other evidence, which other evidence exhibited the entire code of doctrine before the Gospel recorded that portion which it contains, and by the production of the entire evidence, he gives the entire code as it emanated from God himself; he finds no chasm, he wants no link; all is the perfect work of divine wisdom. The Catholic thus, upon evidence, takes "facts as they are:" whilst the Protestants are driven to frame systems, and their systems differ as widely as do their tastes. When they once leave the unity which results from admitting fact, and nothing but fact, they are indeed carried about by every wind of doctrine, and of them it may be truly said, that the chasm between not

what is, but what they choose to admit and what should be, according to their several fancies, must be filled up.

In the third place, I must necessarily deny that the revelation of God consists of only "fragments of real knowledge."

In the fourth place, I cannot conceive what White means by his insinuated charge. "Having agreed that the Gospel was a revelation from God, they could not conceive the possibility of doubt affecting it directly or indirectly." Does he blame them for agreeing to admit the sacred book to be the revelation of God? Or if he does not, does he blame them for giving to it such full credence as excludes all doubt as to its truth? I before said that to criticise the philosophy of this passage was below the occupation of a philosopher. Will the reverend junta of his approbators adopt the philosophy of a man who confounds optimism with the consistency and connexion and sufficiency of God's revealed law under the Christian dispensation?

The next paragraph is indeed to me a most extravagant and astounding rhapsody.

"Had these Christians, however, studied the Scriptures without the bias of such notions, they would have found that the divine author of Christianity has no where provided a remedy against doubt and dissent. There were heretics when the church was still under the personal guidance of the Apostles; yet the New Testament mentions them without allusion to any infallible method of ending these first disputes on doctrines. On a practical question, indeed, we find that St. Paul was sent to ask the opinion of the church of Jerusalem; yet, that very opinion was, in part, set aside and neglected, soon after, by the tacit consent of most other churches.[60] The natural inference from such fact is, that the analogy of God's moral government was not broken in the direct revelation which he made to the world through his own Son; but having granted us convincing proofs that the Scriptures contain the knowledge supernaturally vouchsafed to man he has left the search thereof to human industry. Industry supposes difficulty, and difficulty implies danger. The field of moral discipline does not appear to have been changed by Christianity; the light indeed thrown upon it is clearer, and 'the high prize of our calling' is made fully to shine in our eyes; but it no where appears that we are therefore to close them, and run blindly after certain men endowed with supernatural vision."

Nothing can be more incorrect than his first assumption, viz. that

[60] "The injunction against eating blood and suffocated animals, though given as from the Holy Ghost, was considered as of mere temporary expediency, and set aside as soon as heathen converts formed the majority of Christians."

the mode of learning the revealed doctrines in the first age was by the study of the Scriptures. Although the books of the New Testament were written in the first century, still, more than two others elapsed before there had been any general collection of those books, and an accurate selection of them from several works bearing the names of the Apostles and of others, but which were spurious or of no authority. The converts had been taught the system, if I may so call it, of Christianity, or as I would properly say, were instructed in its doctrines before they were entrusted with the sacred writings, and it was not from the arbitrary explanation of the writings they obtained a knowledge of the doctrines which they previously believed. Neither is it true that the divine author of our faith no where provided a remedy against doubt or dissent: for he declared to the world, who were to be the teachers; he commended belief, and he denounced condemnation against the unbeliever. To quote texts as proof of these propositions would be equivalent to proving to a man who looked at the sun, that he saw that luminary; yet as philosophers have existed who told us that we ought to doubt of the correctness of vision, so have divines who tell us that we ought to doubt the meaning of the texts.

The New Testament mentions heretics indeed and tells us of their character and fate, and how they ought to be avoided: it could not tell of an infallible mode of ending doctrinal disputes with those who would always dispute about doctrine, but it tells us of the pillar and foundation of truth to which we should adhere, nor is it an argument against the infallible authority of our blessed Saviour, that in his day he was heard by perverse and obstinate men who would not end a doctrinal dispute even for his declaration, but when he told them that he would give them his flesh and blood, would not believe the fact, but preferred their own system, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" and walked no more with him. The clumsy attempt to confound the council which was held at Jerusalem with the Church of Jerusalem is even unworthy of the bad cause to sustain which it is made; as well might we say that the Catholic world receives the decision of the Church of Trent as its infallible guide. Equally despicable and fallacious is the effort to confound the doctrinal decision of the council of Jerusalem with its regulation of discipline. The first is irreformable, the latter is changeable. At this day it is equally a doctrine as it was then, that the Mosaic rite is not obligatory upon the Christian, and the repeal of the discipline of not eating blood was made by the Church equally as was the discipline itself established for a time, and the enactment and repeal was equally by the guidance of the Holy Ghost, not in this case stating what

had been revealed, but what was expedient. It was indeed but a poor quibble to play off, when he says "the opinion of the Church of Jerusalem was in part set aside and neglected soon after by the tacit consent of most other Churches." Since the *Acts of the Apostles* inform us (chap. xv), that Paul and Barnabas were sent up not to the Church of Jerusalem, but "to Jerusalem" the city, "unto the Apostles and elders," or ancients, or other Bishops whom the Apostles had ordained, "about this question;" and verse 4, informs us, that "when they were come to Jerusalem they were received by the Church and by the Apostles and Elders," the Scripture distinguishing what White confounds: and verse 6 informs us, that "the Apostles and Elders" and not the Church of Jerusalem "came together to consider of this matter;" and verse 22 informs us, that it "pleased the Apostles and Elders with the whole church" to give the decision of the Holy Ghost. The succesors of those Apostles and Elders with the whole Church have, whilst they preserved the doctrine unchanged, altered the discipline, and therefore White fails in his attempt to establish the variation between the portions of the true Church in the first century, as also in his effort to misrepresent the fact by insinuating that the council of Jerusalem was but a partial assembly, that their decree was but an opinion, and that there was no tribunal then known that could certainly tell the faithful what Christ had revealed.

He then draws what he calls a natural inference from what he calls facts, though in the very previous paragraph he stated his condemnation of this practice of drawing such inferences. But what is more extraordinary is that his inference is made to ascertain what he alleges to be a fact.

For my part, I cannot perceive what he calls convincing proofs, nor any proofs, upon his principle, that the Scriptures contain the knowledge supernaturally vouchsafed to man. He has given us no proof, and I see none that he can give, upon his system: for it is only by the testimony of the Church we can know what the Scriptures really are, and the value of what they contain, and he tells us that this testimony is not sufficient. But suppose it to be manifest that they contain truth, he leaves us to the exercise of industry to find it out, afer having told us that "the mass of those who may be said to think at all, can go no farther in a reasoning process than just to perceive one difficulty against their settled notions, and to catch some verbal quibble which removes the difficulty from their sight," and that "there are indeed but few who can take a true second step in reasoning:" such is the contradiction which results from error!

The closing of our eyes and running blindly after certain men endowed with supernatural vision, being merely the creature of his fancy, I must leave to his own enjoyment.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER LVI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 26, 1828.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—Having seen the manner in which White misrepresents our doctrines, undermines the foundation of faith, destroys all prospect of knowing with certainty what the Redeemer has taught, and egregiously fails in his effort to show variations in our doctrine at the time of the great schism; it would appear to be superfluous to follow him farther upon the subject of Church infallibility: yet the assertions which he makes are so strange that I cannot avoid laying them before you, and making a passing remark upon them.

"Such sober reasoning upon facts, could not be popular in the Christian Church. An infallible judge of abstract questions was wanting, and one was soon found; for St. Peter was the chief of the Apostles, and Rome the chief of the cities."

We would indeed be dolts if we were to found our assertion upon this semblance of reasoning; we do reason upon facts, but the fact which forms the basis of our doctrine is, that Christ did establish the Church to teach his doctrines to the world, and we avow the principle that as he desired to lead those taught to the knowledge of his doctrine, he must have enabled the teacher to bring them thereto. It would, indeed, be a strange exhibition to behold the Saviour directing the people to learn truth from the Church, and declaring that this Church might as well lead them into error as into truth. We reason upon facts; and a main fact upon which we rest is, that Christ repeatedly promised his Spirit of Truth to lead the Apostles who first constituted his Church, into all truth, that they might be enabled to teach it to others; and also that this Spirit was to abide with them all days to the end of the world. We do reason upon facts, when our inquiry is concerning what the Saviour declared to be facts, for his revelation regarded facts, and not abstract questions: we look upon the Church to be the witness of what has been revealed, not the judge of an abstract question. See then how many falsehoods are in this short passage of this faithless writer!

"Nothing therefore appeared more natural, than that Peter should

be Bishop of Rome; and little proof of this fact was demanded: tradition, a mere report, was sufficient for those who wished it to be so."

There was here no natural or unnatural supposition, but a simple question of fact; we say there is unquestionable evidence, that Peter was Bishop of Rome. No fact is better supported by evidence; there was no wish upon the subject: tradition is not mere report; nor is it by tradition, as distinguished from historical evidence, this fact is known. It is testified by witnesses and documents and monuments, at least as satisfactorily as is the existence of Augustus Cæsar as Emperor of Rome.

"Yet something more was necessary to fulfil the object of the first theory or supposition; for Peter could not live for ever, and the judge of faith was to exist till the end of the world. But what could be more natural than that Peter's successors should inherit his supernatural gifts? In popular logic, what is natural, i. e. what agrees with some original supposition, is certain. Subsequent doubts, arising from a system so natural, must be settled any way, or left unsettled."

We have no theory, we exhibit a fact; we argue not from what was natural, but from what had been instituted. It was instituted, that the judge of faith should exist to the end of the world, and that judge was a tribunal pointed out and commissioned by the Saviour; Peter was the chief, the president amongst the commissioners: but he was not the entire tribunal; they who formed the commission knew its constitution, according to the will of its instructor, and they testified that the office of the chief pastor or president of the commission, should last as long as the tribunal itself should continue; and that, upon the death of the incumbent, the power should vest in his successor. Indeed it was natural that such should be the case; but, besides its natural propriety, we have evidence of the fact that it was instituted. It is rather extraordinary effrontery in White and his panegyrists, who have substituted their theories for our facts, to have put forward those passages. Had White written "original institution" for "original supposition," his phraseology would have been correct, but his sophistry would have been too obvious.

"Whether infallibility belonged to the Pope alone, or to the Pope and the Church, and who was to be considered the Church, these minutiæ were left for the ingenuity of divines. The Pope and Rome were all in all for the mass of Christians."

This statement is incorrect: for the doctrine is, that the Church is infallible, and the head and the members constitute the Church; but as in every society, the body has some organ through which its testimony is given, Christ established the Bishops who were to succeed the Apostles,

as that portion which was to examine, to decide, and to testify. Thus, the successor of Peter and the bishops form the teaching portion of the Church, and in them was infallibility vested by the Saviour, not by the ingenuity of divines. The Pope has at least generally, if not always, after consultation with his advisers in the city of Rome, ascertained and declared the sentiment of the Church; and although the Pope and Rome are not all in all for the mass of Christians, obviously the great body of Christians has and ought to have great respect for such declaration.

"The effects of uncontrolled power, however, soon became visible in the monstrous corruptions of Rome herself. Here the second step of popular intellect was required, viz. to seize the happy distinction of infallibility in doctrine, and profligacy in morals."

Had the writer given us some definite subject, instead of the vague phrase "Rome herself," and had he specified what were the "monstrous corruptions," we might be able to give a precise answer to his distinct assertion; but as he deals in those general expressions, his words have too indistinct a meaning to be fairly met. However, it is not true that the "power" of Rome is "uncontrolled:" it is limited, and it has been controlled. If he means that the Holy See corrupted or changed the doctrine of Christ, he states what is not the fact: if he intends to charge upon it a corruption of the principles of morality, he does so, not only without proof, but against the fact: if he only means that several individuals, in the administration of the Church, have been immoral men, I shall admit the fact, though I will not subscribe to the unmeasured extent of monstrous language. In the long catalogue of Popes, we find a splendid succession of men of greater virtue, more extensive learning, more prudent, and more venerable than ever appeared in any other office; men of criminal conduct have indeed rarely been found in the apostolic chair, but a Judas was admitted by the Saviour himself into the apostolic band. What the venerable junta condemns under the ironical phrase of the "happy distinction," is taught by the Saviour himself in *Matthew* xxiii, 1, 2, 3.

"Who that loves wealth, power, and pleasure, would wish to be a sinless oracle?"

What is the object, and what is the meaning of this expletive sentence some one else must determine; I cannot.

"No; the system of spiritual supremacy was now complete; the original supposition, that the Church could not resist the attacks of hell without an unerring judge of abstract questions, had been followed to its remotest consequences: he that ventured to doubt the accuracy of the

whole theory was declared a heretic. The Pope might be, in his conduct, an enemy of Christ and his Gospel, and nevertheless succeed in the enjoyment of whatever privileges were granted to Peter, in consequence of the love which, above the other Apostles, he bore to his divine master. He might be a monster of vices, yet he did not cease to be vicar of him who did no sin. The Church, under his guidance, might be corrupt in 'head and members;' but still she must be infallible in matters of faith."

The assumptions of the first portion of this paragraph have been all proved to be false: and the statement regarding what constitutes "a heretic," is incorrect. A heretic is a person who obstinately rejects a sufficiently proposed article of faith: an article of faith is a doctrine revealed by God; those doctrines are not "abstract questions." The doctrines of Christianity do not constitute a theory; they are the declarations of facts by a God who knows them to be true.

But we have, in the latter part of the sentence, a good specimen of the want of candor of our noble defamer. In his Letter III, when examining the title to supremacy claimed by the Roman Church, White gave us, page 88, as the only ground upon which Peter claimed supremacy, the text concerning the change of the name of Simon to Peter, as read in *Matthew* xvi; now finding it convenient to avoid this text, because of its containing evidence of a continuation of the privilege for ever, he refers to a text which he had not even noticed before:

"Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these; He saith unto him, Yea Lord thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, feed my lambs."—*John* xxi, 15, *et seq.*

And tells us that his text, which is thus garbled by omitting two verses, is that upon which we ground the privileges of Peter, and of his successor; thus, he shows that he knew and concealed the advantages derivable from this passage, where he affected to give our arguments for refutation. Here, too, he is incorrect; because, although our blessed Lord might have selected Peter, because of his love, as the person to bear the supreme commission in the first instance, yet it was not in consequence of that love that the commission was established, but for the purpose of preserving that unity which was so great an object of the Saviour's solicitude.

His last assertion is one of those misrepresentations which are usually found in his book; the disingenuous garbling of a few words, by means whereof an unwary reader might be led to imagine that the whole proposition was granted, because a few of its words are found in the concession. We never admitted that the Church was corrupt, or

might be corrupt in its head and members, though occasionally the head might be infirm, and some members corrupt, but perhaps the soundest body will always contain some discord or infirm part. The college of the Apostles needed the ejection of Judas, yet the whole of the sacred body was far from being corrupt.

"To the solidity of this structure have your divines committed the stability of the Church of Christ; unless all this be true, the gates of hell have actually prevailed against her. A moral corruption in head and members; a system which ensured the continuance of this corruption, by repeatedly defeating the efforts of those who wished for a reformation, were, if we believe them, no subject of triumph to the enemy of God and man. As long as the authority of Rome was safe, the gates of hell had still the worst of the contest: let the Pope possess the heads of Christians, and Satan was welcome to their hearts."

It is not upon the solidity of White's misrepresentations that we rest the stability of the Church; we do not admit the truth of his statements; we deny the existence of the moral corruption, whose existence he has supposed without proof; we deny, too, that the system against which he declaims, either ensured the continuance of corruption, or defeated the efforts to which he alludes. Whilst the majority of the Christian body preserved the true faith, the gates of hell did not prevail; and none amongst us would subscribe the blasphemy which, as a semblance of his wit, concludes the passage:

"The followers of Luther," says Bossuet, "assuming the title of reformers, glorified that they had fulfilled all Christendom's desires, inasmuch as a reformation had been long the desire of Catholics, people, doctors and prelates. In order, therefore, to authorize this pretended reformation, whatsoever church writers had said against the disorders, both of the people, and even the clergy, was collected with great industry. But in this lay a manifest of conceit, there not being so much as one of the passages alleged, wherein the doctors ever dreamt of altering the Church's faith; of correcting her worship, which chiefly consisted in the sacrifice of the altar; of subverting the authority of her Prelates, that of the Pope especially—the very scope which this whole reformation, introduced by Luther, tended to."

Was White faithful in giving us here the phrase, "manifest conceit," for what Bossuet gives as "plain sophistry," or if he likes the sound better, "manifest deceit."

"If there be any conceit in the matter, it is that of admitting the extreme corruption of the Christian Church, with the unavailing efforts of the advocates of reform, who preceded Luther; and yet blaming the

Protestants, because, by making the Pope's supremacy the 'very scope' of their reformation, they took the only effectual method of putting an end to the evil. The absurd notion, that the unity of the Church of Christ depended on unity with the Bishop of Rome, tied the hands of all Christians, who wanted either the knowledge or the courage to examine the airy basis of that system.

"The sword and the faggot, besides, stood in the way of approach to that delicate point; else the invectives so carefully restricted to morals would not have always left the doctrines untouched. Submit your understanding to Rome; confess that you cannot hope for salvation out of the Pope's communion; acknowledge that immorality and wickedness do not detract from his supernatural privileges; and on these conditions you are at liberty to oppose the corruptions of the Church of Christ. Conceit is not, indeed, a word which should apply to such advice; deceit would seem more appropriate."

The basis was that rock which Christ himself had required. How far the one was airy and the other absurd, it is not for me to examine with what White calls courage, but I call impiety.

To say that unity of faith was preserved by persecution is neither novel nor true; to assert that they who defended that faith, whilst they sought to reform the discipline of the Church, were afraid, because of punishment, to declare their convictions, is to charge with base hypocrisy the best men in Christendom. It is natural, if White likes the phrase, to expect the charge from a man who, upon his own avowal, was a base hypocrite during ten years, and upwards; from a man who began his dissimulation in that period of life which exhibits candor and generosity, if they exist at all. And who was to punish those men, if they made the declaration? Were they not the men who, it is said, directed this sword and fired this faggot? Were they not the principal clergy of the Church?

I have done with this weak and faithless portion of the evidence, which exhibits more want of truth in a few pages, and accumulates more falsehoods within the same space than most others which have disgusted me.

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER LVII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Mar. 3, 1828.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—The remaining portion of White's fourth letter calls

for very few remarks. I shall let this champion of Protestantism and opponent of Catholicism speak for himself.

"Invariableness in doctrine is Bossuet's criterion of the Christian characteristic of unity; but surely any set of men, who agreed on a system similar to that on which Roman unity depends, might equally boast of invariableness and unity; surely there cannot be, at least there cannot appear, any difference of opinion in a society which excludes every member who does not submit his own views to those of one individual, placed at its head; and which lays down, as an indubitable fact, that that individual, whoever he may happen to be, and whatever he may add to the common doctrines of the society, always speaks the mind of his predecessors, and only gives explicitness to things implied in former decisions. Such is the artful contrivance which the author of the *Variations of the Protestant Churches* disguises into a miraculous unity of doctrine and belief; the effect, as he pretends, of Christ's promise of support to his Church against the gates of hell."

Would White, or would the theological phalanx which has in this country arrayed itself under his banner, assert that unity and variableness of doctrine are compatible?—Would they assert that Christ taught variable doctrine? If they would, how will they assert that he is the God of truth; for truth is invariable? St. Paul told the Christians of his day that if an angel from heaven was to preach to them a doctrine varying from that which he had taught them, they were to reject him as anathema. But however absurd the assertion that the one faith of the Christian is compatible with variable, and varying and contradictory doctrine, what other can be expected from a collected host of every species of Protestant clergymen, who unite to publish the calumnies of White against a Church whose doctrines are unvarying and consistent?

As to the possibility of such a result being created by the agreement of any set of men, there are too many facts to destroy the theory. Every body of men that separated from the Catholic Church has made the experiment and has made a miserable failure; they could neither preserve unity nor invariableness during half a century, not during the first five years, in any region in Christendom, from the days of Ebion and Cerinthus in the time of the Apostles, down to the present day, which exhibits to us such a diversity of contradictions all said to have emanated from a God of truth. They have excluded from communion, they have fulminated censures, they have enacted penal laws, they have plundered Catholics and each other, they have crowded prisons and loaded gibbets with members of our Church, and of the various sectaries

who separated from themselves or from whom they separated; and whilst the minority of those who professed the Christian name have been thus fruitlessly endeavoring to preserve unity and invariableness in some of their thousand divisions, the Catholic Church, spread into every nation of the globe, having her children separated by seas, by mountains, by language, by custom, by jealousies, by wars, and whatever else could estrange man from his fellow man, has during eighteen centuries preserved her doctrines unvaried; and this day shows upwards of one hundred and fifty millions of the human race, from California through America, Europe, Africa and Asia, to China, united in the profession of those doctrines. If what White calls additions to common doctrines of the society, be innovations, and not explanations, which only give explicitness to things implied in former decisions, let him produce to us the contradictory decisions, let him show variation between the doctrine of former ages and the present in our Church, in a single doctrinal point, and we give up our claim.

After what I have previously remarked upon the dishonesty of his assertion, that we are required to submit our own views to those of one individual, I may be allowed to meet the passage with the mildest epithet which suits it, untruth.

"Raking up, besides, all the calumnies and atrocious reports with which the character of the opposers of Rome has been blackened at all times, and setting in the strongest light of mutual opposition the theological disputes which divided the reformers, he gives the whole weight of his authority and talents to a delusion, which nothing but an overwhelming combination of interest and prejudice could prevent his acute mind from perceiving."

Bossuet raked up the calumnies only from the writings of Luther, Calvin, Beza, Melancthon, and their associates. White and his American aides are welcome to style their fathers in the faith calumniators if they please. I shall not enter into their family disputes, I shall neither call the fathers calumniators nor the children impious: nor shall I say that the latter are the imitators of Cham. Indeed I have known several of the spiritual sons of those forgetful Patriarchs of the reformation, as they are pleased to call it, who probably did not see the shameful scene; as I believe they did intentionally walk backwards and on set purpose keep their eyes averted, that they might still preserve the veneration which they had drawn in with their earliest sustenance. White and the junta would have done better in telling us what the delusion was under which Bossuet labored, than to tell us that he was deluded.

"Had the Bishop of Meaux bestowed the ten thousandth part of

the perverse industry with which he followed that argument, in examining the gratuitous assumption on which it is founded, we may hope that his honesty would have directed his pen to some other topic. Instead of availing himself of the inveterate notion that Christ had established an infallible judge in his church, lest, by the existence of doubt as to the sense of the Scriptures, there should be diversity of opinion among his followers—instead of taking it for granted, that the victory of hell depended on the diversity of abstract doctrines among Christians, and not in the prevalence of dark works of wickedness, provided they were wrought in the unity of papal faith—he should, in the spirit of philosophical reasoning, have penetrated to that part of the argument which conceals the gratuitous assumptions whence the Roman Catholic theory has sprung."

I am not astonished that White and the junta dislike the book: but really the notion that Christ had established the Church as an infallible judge of doctrine was extremely inveterate in the days of Bossuet, having been then about seventeen centuries in existence. But the gentlemen are in too great haste when they assume without our leave that we teach that the gates of hell would not have prevailed against the Church, if the works of darkness were to be wrought by all its members. But when we deny his assumption, he would gain but little by our admitting that sanctity was also to be a characteristic of the true Church; for we can prove that sanctity and infallibility co-existed.

"When Catholics have proved without the aid of church authority, that the church of Christ must be infallible, then, and not before, they may object their variations to the Protestants."

We have done so and we use his license.

"The Protestants have varied in search of the divine simplicity of the Gospel, which Rome had buried under a mountain of metaphysical notions. The Protestants have varied, because they could not at once divest themselves of the habits of thinking which they had acquired in the Roman Catholic schools. The Protestants have varied, because they had the honesty not to imitate the contrivances by which the Roman Church gives to her new decisions the appearance of unity with the preceding. The Protestants have varied, because they would not, upon the fanciful notion of a perpetual miracle, claim for any of their churches the supernatural gift of unerring wisdom, nor counterfeit by obstinancy in error, the conscious certainty of inspiration. The Protestants in fine, have varied, because, by restoring the Scriptures to their full and unrivalled authority, they perceive the intrinsic power of settled, recorded, invariable revelation; and were aware that, in spite of doubts and div-

isions, the light of those divine records needed no help to withstand the attacks of the gates of hell."

The fact of variation being admitted, I care not for its cause. A church which varies in its teaching cannot be the Church of Christ, because his Church was always to teach his doctrine, and his doctrine is not at variance with itself, this church which varies in its teaching must then at one time have taught a doctrine which was not that of Christ, and as I can have no guarantee for one time rather than another, I can never be certain of learning truth from that church. It cannot therefore be the Church of Christ which he established to teach the true doctrine, all days, to the end of the world.

But let us try the logic of White's causations. His first assumption is that Rome buried the doctrine of Christ under a mountain of metaphysical notions. This is as easily denied as it is asserted. Now I assert she did not bury them. The Gospel which she preserved was in the words of its original writers, she gave this to those persons who are by their own children called calumniators and reformers: its divine simplicity was in their hands, they need not go under a mountain for what they already had.

Next they varied because they could not divest themselves at once of the habits of thinking which they had acquired in the Roman Catholic schools. In page 116, we are told that this was to submit their views to those of one individual placed at its head—admirable cause of variation. Why does not this habit of thinking produce its effects amongst ourselves? How can this habit of thinking influence those who have never been in our schools, and such are the discordant divines of the Protestant Churches during nearly three centuries? It is an admirable logic to attribute a palpable fact to one with which in one case it has no connection, and another case to a cause which produces a contrary effect ! !

The third cause is an assertion against the fact, for they did attempt by every contrivance which they could devise, from creeds and anathemas to confiscations, dungeons, tortures and death; and made a miserable failure.

The fourth cause is but the expression of bitter disappointment; and only proves the absence of that cause which existed in the church to which they were opposed.

The fifth and last is an assumption that the consistent revelation of the God of truth is compatible with inconsistency, doubt and error; and is the last refuge of Protestantism. It is in fact the proclamation of despair. "We take this book to be the word of God who desires

to teach us this law, but we cannot agree [as] to its meaning: he speaks, but we are not certain what he says,—let every body believe what he likes, and thus each will have a doctrine to his own taste, and although we shall have innumerable contradictions, still we shall all be right, and all will hold the truth."

I shall in my next conclude my remarks on this fourth letter.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

LETTER LVIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Mar. 10, 1828.

To the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.

My Friends,—In closing my remarks upon White's fourth letter, I must rather present to you some dusultory observations upon his detached paragraphs, than give any thing of a regular dissertation or lengthened argument.

After having acknowledged what he could not deny, that Protestants varied in their doctrine, he proceeds in giving his extraordinary notion of unity. Let us however see the nature and the consequences of the variations. One division of Protestants tells us that Christ is really present in the Eucharist: such is the doctrine of the consistent Lutherans: another division, the Zuinglians, declare that he is not really present in this sacrament: each profess to tell us what Christ taught: now it is clear that our blessed Lord could not have taught two contradictory propositions: he must have taught whether he was or was not present in this sacrament: one of the contradictory sects must then be in error, and the one that is in error must also contradict the Saviour, and contradiction to the Saviour is the undermining of faith. Where this contradiction exists, unity of faith is lost: and the loss of unity of faith causes men to deny the revelation of God. If God only revealed what it was necessary for man to know, they who tell us that it is a matter of indifference whether we know what God has revealed, give us a very erroneous notion of his wisdom: in fact they tell us " God revealed the doctrine which he wished you to believe, but it is a matter of indifference whether you believe it, nor is it essential that you should know what he has taught." Can this be less than blasphemy?

But the variation does not consist only in the contradiction of sect to sect; but in the contradiction of the same sect to itself. Thus for instance, the work of Bossuet exhibits not only the Lutheran of his day contradicting the Lutheran of an earlier period, but Luther contradict-

ing himself, and all the early seceders whom in this country it has been usual to style Reformers, contradicting themselves. We then ask, "Did your predecessors teach the doctrine of Christ?" If they say "yes;" we then reply, "Then in leaving their doctrine you have left the doctrine of the Saviour." If they say "no," we reply "Then they whom you call Reformers and Apostles contradicting what you teach as God's revelation were opposed to God's truth, and could not be his servants." But we not only agree in all nations in our doctrines, sacraments and government: notwithstanding the ridiculous and mischievous efforts of some misguided men in this country, who know very little about their religion, and never practice its duties, to constitute themselves as a new kind of governors, under the name of Vestries and Patrons: but we hold to the doctrinal decisions and sacramental institutions and form of government of every age during the centuries that Christianity has existed. Let us then view what White says:

"If mere controversy were my object, I should feel satisfied with having demonstrated that the system of Roman Catholic unity is but an arbitrary contrivance; a gratuitous assumption of a supernatural privilege, which is no where clearly asserted in the Scriptures; an endeavor to produce certainty by a standard conceived and planned upon conjecture. A more Christian feeling, however induces me to dwell still on this subject, and propose to you what I conceive to be the true scriptural notions on the unity of the Church of Christ."

Upon this I shall remark that it can be no gratuitous assumption, when the very nature of faith requires unity of doctrine, and it is clearly revealed in those various parts of the Scriptures, which show us that we should not be carried about by every wind of doctrine, and that we should believe what Christ has taught, and the Apostles have preached: and that we should obey those whom he commissioned. But let us see White's scheme of unity.

"In reading the New Testament with a mind carefully freed from the prejudices of school divinity, it is impossible not to perceive that the assemblies of men who are called to obtain salvation through Christ either singly or collectively constitute the Church, whereof the Roman See has tried to appropriate the qualities and privileges to herself. Wherever men assemble in the name of Jesus, there he has promised to be by means of his spirit; and certainly the works of that spirit are more or less visible in the Christian virtues, which never yet failed to spring up in these particular churches, though mixed with the tares and other evils, which are not separable from 'the kingdom of Heaven' in this world. But there is a structure of sanctity in perpetual progress, to-

wards the completion of which the Christian churches, on earth, are only made to contribute as different quarries do towards the raising of some glorious building. The churches on earth partake, in various proportions, of the attributes of the great Church of Christ, 'which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.' But the Church to which the great privileges and graces belong, has characteristic marks which cannot be claimed by any one of the churches on earth: for it is that church 'which Christ loved, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.' To become members of that church we should, indeed, 'endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; but such unity is proposed as the effect of endeavor, and consequently of choice and judgment, not of blind submission to a silencing authority, which is the Roman bond of union. The true unity of Christians must arise from the 'one hope of our calling.' There is indeed for us, 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism;' but that faith is faith of trust, a 'confidence, which hath great recompense of reward,'[61] not an implicit belief in the assumed infallibility of men who make a monoply of the written word of God, prescribe the sense in which it must be understood, and with a refined tyranny, which tramples equally upon Christian liberty, and the natural rights of the human mind; insult even silent dissent, and threaten bodily punishment to such as, in silence and privacy, may have indulged the freedom of their minds.''

I had better give a translation of this note which so exceedingly terrifies him: yet it is very simple; it only says that the Scripture has only one true meaning, and is not a parcel of contradictions; and that the Church, a great assembly of Christians, has from the beginning testified this meaning, as well as the book itself; and therefore that it is irreligious to put arbitrary meanings upon the sacred volume.

Moreover, in order to restrain petulant minds, the same holy synod decrees, that no person relying upon his own prudence, torturing to his own notions the sacred Scriptures, in those things which concern faith and morals, relating to the edification of Christian doctrine, in contradiction to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures, shall dare to interpret these sacred writings, or otherwise than according to the tenacious consent of the Fathers;

[61] *Heb.* x, 35.

although such interpretation should not be at any time published. Let whosoever shall contravene be denounced by the ordinaries, and undergo the penalties legally enacted.

I know not by what ingenuity White converted the spiritual censures legally enacted by the Church into bodily punishment. The council had not, neither did it assume, or pretend to have power to inflict bodily punishment.

"Such is the saving faith of the Council of Trent! How different from that proposed by St. Paul, when he says, 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' 'That is the word of faith which we preach,' says St. Paul; and well might that faith be made the bond of union between all the churches which the Apostles saluted, without requiring a previous proof of their implicit submission. 'Grace be with them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity,' is St. Paul's language. Cursed be they who, whatever be their love of Christ and veneration for the Scriptures, yield not obedience to the Church of Rome, is the spirit of every page which has been published by Popes or Councils."

"Whatever might be the effect of the prejudices which the first reformers brought away from their Roman captivity; whatever the necessity which Protestant churches still acknowledge of preventing internal feuds, by proposing formularies of faith to their members, they have never so misunderstood 'what spirit they are of,' as to deny salvation to those who love their common Lord and Redeemer. Their churches, indeed, may differ on points which the subtilty of metaphysics had unfortunately started long before the Reformation, and even before the publication of Christianity; they may observe different ceremonies, and adopt different views of church hierarchy and discipline; but their spirit is the only one which deserves the name of Catholic, in the genuine sense of that word; the only spirit indeed which can produce, even on earth, an image of the glorious Church which will exist for ever in one fold and under one shepherd."

I shall now proceed to make a few observations on this extraordinary piece of theology, which seems to say what is religious, but really speaks contradiction.

First. In reading the New Testament without or with the impressions of school divinity, we must perceive what common sense teaches, that Christ did not state that contradiction to his doctrine was equally acceptable to him, and useful to man, as a belief and adherence to what he taught: and that the assemblies of men, who are called to obtain sal-

vation, were to believe his doctrine, and thus to constitute his Church. The Church, in union with the Roman See, will be easily perceived to have the mark of this unity of faith, to attain which others have long since despaired; and thereupon declared it to be unnecessary.

Secondly. The Saviour did and does manifest his presence in that Church, by the miracles which in every age, even in this our own, and in this our own country, have been wrought therein; as also by the sanctity of the doctrine which she teaches, and by the millions of saints which she has and does produce.

Thirdly. The pretty figure of a quarry might be poetical, but is not applicable; for Christ's Church is not composed of error and contradiction. Its members should endeavor to have not only that unity of faith which they do possess, but the unity of spiritual charity which they do not always preserve, but which the Apostle exhorts them not to lose. White is disingenuous, when he confounds things which are distinct, that he might bewilder by the similiarity of names, and the misapplication of the text.

Fourthly. His assumption of unity consisting in "one hope of calling" is gratuitous, and contradicts not only the testimony of all nations and ages of the Church, but several passages of the sacred volume; and amongst others, that very text which he quotes and misinterprets, by making faith mean trust or hope. This is, indeed, a miserable mode of denying the necessity of faith, without which it is impossible to please God.

Fifthly. It is untrue that the saving faith of the Council of Trent is an implicit belief in the assumed infallibility of men who make a monopoly of the written word of God. As well might he charge courts of justice with a monopoly of the statute law, because they prescribe the sense in which it must be understood, and declare that it must always have the same meaning, and not be tortured and made ridiculous by the contradictory ravings of partial litigants. Neither is this infallibility assumed: for it has been established by Christ, and was demanded by reason, by religion, and by the exigencies of society. It is required for the perfection of faith, that we believe all those things which God has revealed; and amongst the facts of revelation, he taught us that he insured to his Church infallible correctness in judging and testifying what he taught. But yet the Council of Trent does not call this faith "saving" unless it be accompanied by hope and charity: it declares faith to be necessary, but not sufficient for salvation. In the sixth session, chap. viii, it declares:

"When the Apostle saith that a man is justified by faith and gratis,

those words are to be understood in that sense which the perpetual consent if the Catholic Church hath held and expressed: to wit, we are thus said to be justified by faith, because faith is the origin of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God, and to come to the fellowship of his children," and so forth.

And in the preceding chapter of the same session, we read:

"No person can be just, except he to whom the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ are communicated; but this takes place in the justification of the sinner, whilst by the merit of the same most holy passion, the charity of God is poured out into the hearts of those who are justified by the Holy Ghost, and it dwelleth in them; whence, in the very justification itself, the man receives through Jesus Christ into whom he is engrafted, together with the remission of sins, all those infused with graces, faith, hope, and charity; because, unless hope and charity were added thereto, faith doth neither perfectly unite him in Christ, nor make him a living member of his body. For which reason it is most truly said, that faith without works is dead; and, in Christ Jesus, neither doth circumcision avail aught nor the foreskin, but faith which worketh by charity."

Thus White and his abettors have grossly misrepresented the Council of Trent.

Seventhly. Surely if White and the junta require no farther faith or belief than what he here lays down, they cannot accuse the Unitarians of destroying faith, and yet they do, upon their own principles, treat this division of Christians most unceremoniously, for no other cause than that they use the good Protestant prerogative of interpreting the Scriptures, not according to that sense which our holy mother the Church hath held and does hold, nor according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, but against their consent and judgment. Unitarians do believe in their hearts that God raised the Lord Jesus from the dead, and with their mouths they confess the Lord Jesus. Why, then, do other Protestants dare to say they will not be saved? Why exclude them from "the bond of union?" They say that they love the Lord Jesus in sincerity; why will other Protestants assume and assert what they do not?

Eighthly. The Church makes no such curse; but she says, that no person who wilfully rejects the truth and testimony of God can love Christ; that no person can venerate the Scriptures, and despise the tribunal from which the Scriptures have been received; and, therefore,

the Church in communion with the See of Rome denies that she condemns those who love the Saviour.

Ninthly. If Catholic faith means the approval of every error, nothing can be more degrading to man, or more offensive to truth than Catholic faith. God forbid that I should say that Catholic faith is the collection of all folly, fanaticism, and contradiction which the world has witnessed and religion has wept over, from the days of Simon Magus to those of Johanna Southcote or General Smyth: for, indeed, such would not be one fold, and we would be at a loss to know who was their shepherd! I have done with White's doctrinal misrepresentations, calumnies, and ignorance, in his first four letters. I have not yet determined as to whether I ought to take up the abomination and blasphemy of his other two. I shall take a few days to reflect.

Yours, and so forth,

B. C.

[The series of letters here terminates; the Bishop having been determined by his reflections, or by the pressure of some other engagements, to let White's two remaining letters be answered by silence, and pass into that oblivion which would soon cover up the memory of all his crimes, blasphemies, and signal misfortunes, were it not for their accidental connection with the spotless name and reputation of the one who has here chastised him, and with those of others like him remarkable for their fidelity to the holy faith which this wretched man betrayed.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE MISREPRESENTED.

Letters addressed to The Rev. William Hawley.

[The following Series of Letters, occasioned by a violent attack upon the members of the Catholic Church, made in the columns of a periodical published in Washington, and conducted by several clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church, appeared in the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, for 1824-5, and were afterwards published in a pamphlet form.]

LETTER I.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 4, 1824.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—In your *Theological Repertory for November*, 1824, is an article headed "Roman Catholic Doctrines." After a most patient reperusal of this piece I find it to be a gross misrepresentation of Roman Catholics, conveyed to your readers in unbecoming language, and a most unfounded calumny of my persecuted fellow-countrymen wantonly introduced, together with some historical blunders.

Were this the first time that you exhibited your zeal to attack an unoffending church, and a meritorious people, I should have perhaps been satisfied to warn you of your errors in the hope that your zeal and your ignorance might plead your excuse. But the result of your late efforts being your total discomfiture, your zeal should have given way to prudence, and you ought to have studied to learn whether your statements were correct before you ventured to appear before a discerning public. Sirs, I shall prove those statements to be totally devoid of truth, and you then will be left to choose between want of information and want of honesty. In either case you will be proved unqualified for editors of a religious publication.

I stated, sirs, that you attacked an unoffending church. I now ask you, what offence has the Roman Catholic Church of this Union given to you? What offence has the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, given to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States?

Do you answer, sirs, for I am at a loss to know what answers you can give. Will you have recourse to the old differences at the other side of the Atlantic? Sirs, your church is not there to be found. There is a church like yours it is true. But, sirs, no theologian who had any respect for his character, would assert that and yours to be the same church, however similar they may be. However, this is not now matter for our inquiry. But suppose the Church of England and yours to be what they are not, the same; when, where, or how have the Roman Catholics of the United States offended your church in Europe? What is the pretext, then, of your attack? You may, sirs, recollect the fable of the lamb drinking at the stream, and asked by a wolf who drank at the same rivulet, though much higher up, why he made the water so muddy as to render it unfit for the majesty of the wolf; "Do you not perceive that the water cannot flow up the stream?" replied the lamb. "Perhaps so," rejoined the wolf, "but twelve months ago you made it muddy in another place." "Indeed," replied the lamb, "I was not born then." "But your father was," said the wolf, "and I will make you suffer." Thank God, however, the Constitution of the United States will not give Messrs. Hawley & Company all the power which they would be disposed to exercise to our injury.

Will you, sirs, point out any persecution of the English Church by Roman Catholics of America? You know, sirs, that the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, about which you have written so much falsehood in so few lines, was not committed by American Catholics nor upon Protestant Episcopalians. Sirs, in this happy country, Protestants and Catholics are united in bonds of amity, their intercourse is unrestrictedly affectionate. I, therefore, am totally at a loss for any reason why you and writers of your description, should be so anxious and so unremitting in their endeavours to interrupt this harmony, to create jealousy, to produce in America the miseries of European dissensions. The Roman Catholic Church of America has too long permitted herself to be assailed with impunity by every essayist in an unmeaning religious cant; it is time to exhibit their deformity. You must show, not by declamation, but by facts, in what your church has been offended by ours in these United States, or you stand convicted of having attacked an unoffending church.

You have, sirs, charged a meritorious people with crimes of which they are not guilty. You have accused the hereditary Earl Marshal of England, the premier peer of the realm, the Duke of Norfolk, of being in principle a traitor to his government, although that government, with the exception of about ten bigots in the House of Lords, has in the

last session of Parliament, directly contradicted you. What is his crime? He refuses to swear that the King of England is the supreme head of his church? Is this a crime? Will you swear that he is the head of your church? Will Bishop White swear that the King of England is the supreme head of your church? Is Bishop White a traitor? Can the venerable eldest prelate of your church be in principle a faithful citizen of this country, though he should refuse to swear that the King of England is the supreme head of his church? But, sirs, that Bishop did once swear that the King of England was the head of his church, and he afterwards rejected that headship; yet will you dare to call him a traitor? Why, then, call men traitors who never believed, never professed, never swore to any such headship; whose ancestors were plundered of their property, many of them dragged out their lives in prisons, several of whom were put to death because they would not swear what they did not believe to be true. Though you should even look upon those men to have erred in faith because they did not swear that the King of England was the visible head of God's church, yet you must allow them the merit of having suffered for conscience sake. Yet, sirs, in the plenitude of your liberality, and with singular consistency, you who do not acknowledge it to be necessary for salvation, to swear the oath of supremacy, tell us that the British and Irish Catholics who refuse to swear it ought to be persecuted, that they are on a level with the wretched criminals who are sent to New Holland. What has the Duke of Norfolk done, what has the Earl of Shrewsbury done, what have the millions of Catholics whose grievances resound through Europe done to provoke your ire, that you, claiming to be American citizens, should thus sentence them to transportation because they follow the conviction of their consciences?

Look at your words: when you can produce no charge against the Roman Catholics of the United States, you arraign the Catholics of Great Britain. These are your expressions:

"Such are the doctrines of a church, the members of which have raised such an outcry against the intolerant spirit of the English government for not receiving them to a full share in its administration. They might as well accuse that government of cruelty, for banishing the wretched criminals to New Holland; or of illiberality, for punishing the man who traitorously conspires against his country."

And is this the language of American citizens? Is this the liberality of an Association of Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States? I solemnly assure you that such a possibility could not be conceived in Europe; and what is the crime of those traitors who are placed on a level with the wretched criminals who are banished to New Holland? They will not swear that the King of England is the

visible head in earth of God's Church! ! ! This is the head and front of their offence.

Will the Quaker swear it? Will the Presbyterian swear it? Will the Congregationalist swear it? Will the Unitarian swear it? Will the Baptist swear it? Will Mr. Hawley swear it? Will any Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church now swear it? And are all those traitors to be now sent as wretched criminals to New Holland? And their banishment will not be an act even of illiberality! !

No! Mr. Hawley and his associates will not banish those good men; none deserve banishment as wretched criminals and traitors, but those Irish papists. Is this the language of gentlemen? No, sirs, it is not. Is this the language of scholars? Is it the language of Christians? No, sirs; but I shall leave to the people of America to designate your characteristic.

What is the head and front of the charge? No oath can bind Irish papists to heretics. What is the proof? I shall examine first the probability of your charge in the special case which you adduce. I shall then give you the facts; I shall then take up your general principle and your semblances of authority. But, sirs, I shall not conclude in this nor in my next letter.

What are the facts of your special case? The English government tells its Catholic subjects, "you must be disfranchised until you swear that you believe the King of England is head of the church, and that no foreign prelate has or ought to have any spiritual or ecclesiastical authority in this realm." The Catholic answers, "I do not believe either of the propositions to be true." The government answers, "I do not care what you believe, I only want you to swear." To show that I state the case fairly, I could produce several instances of well-known persons who did not believe the truth of the doctrines required to be sworn to, but who, pressed by the danger of losing their property and their rights, did in a moment of temptation go into the Protestant Churches and read the forms, and into courts and take the oaths, and publicly declare, as soon as they received their certificates from the minister and the clerk of the crown, that they did not believe, but merely went through the form to comply with the law and to save themselves from ruin; and yet they were ever after considered good and lawful Protestants. Those disgusting recitals are painful to me: but, sirs, you have wantonly, I was about to add another expression, provoked them, and I suppress much which I would wish to forget. I was right, then, when I stated the answer of the British government to be, "We care not for your belief, we only want you to swear." The Catholics who continued faith-

ful, that is the Irish papists, said, "We will not swear what we do not believe," and their property was swallowed up by the men who swore. Yet Mr. Hawley and his associates are kind enough to say those men had no regard for their oaths! ! ! Yes, the men who gave up their estates, their liberties, their homes, many of them their lives, and who could at once emancipate themselves by merely taking an oath which Mr. Hawley proclaims they do not consider binding, but which is all that the British government requires! ! ! Did I take that oath, I would have avoided many of the ills of life. Did my ancestors take it, my lot would not have been poverty and the contemptuous oppression of the plunderer of my patrimony, who, to gain what I lost, swore what, perhaps, he did not believe. But my conscience has no sting, and in this free country I may meet Mr. Hawley and his associates as they deserve.

In the name of common justice, in the name of common sense, I ask, is it probable? Is it possible that those men who, sooner than swear one false oath to Protestants, permitted those same Protestants to run riot with their estates, their liberties and their lives, and those of their descendants did not believe an oath to heretics was binding, or ought to be observed?

Why were the Catholic Bishops turned out of their sees by Queen Elizabeth? because they would not swear what they did not believe. Why was Bishop Fisher beheaded? Because he would not swear that oath. Why was Archbishop Plunkett hanged, drawn, and quartered? Because he would not take that oath. Sirs, I will not increase the disgusting catalogue which I could swell to thousands, in whose blood the contradictions to your libels might be written. You must be either totally uninformed as to the proceedings in Great Britain, during the last eight or ten years, or you must be the most careless of reputation or credit of any public writers that ever ventured to brave an enlightened public. The greatest bigot on the benches of the House of Peers, the most infatuated old simpleton who peruses Fox's Martyrology, the most unblushing declaimer against Popery, the most degraded hawker of a paragraph for an Orange publication in the British islands, would feel himself overwhelmed with shame and confusion, did he venture to express, within the last few years, so gross a falsehood; though it was, for party purposes, imposed as unquestioned truth upon the people of Great Britain, for upwards of two centuries before. This atrocious calumny, like the depositions of the Rev. Titus Oates, has long since been treated with its well-merited reprobation in the British Parliament. Lord Stafford has been replaced in his rank, and, notwithstanding the

opposition of the following bigots, the Premier Earl of England has been restored to his honours, though not to his rights, without requiring him to swear what he could not believe:

"Minority in the House of Lords against the Bill for allowing the Duke of Norfolk to execute the office of Earl Marshal, June 18, 1824: Dukes, York and Beaufort — Earls, Eldon, Macclesfield, Shaftesbury, Abingdon and Verulam — Archbishop of Canterbury — Bishops, Gloucester and Raphoe — Lord Gifford."

The King of England, the remainder of the Peers, and the House of Commons, with unanimity voted that he should, though a Roman Catholic, be permitted to do the duties of an office from which his ancestors and he had been excluded during two centuries under false pretences. Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox, Mr. Percival, Lord Liverpool, Lord Sidmouth, Mr. Grattan, Mr. Canning, Mr. Brougham, Lord Grenville, Lord Grey, Lord Erskine, and hundreds of men like these, pronounced, after close examination, your virulent charge to be an atrocious calumny.

Good God! Then is America fallen so low? Is her intellect so debased? Are these states become such a link of ignorance, as that all the rejected falsehoods of Europe are to find this as their asylum? Are we, who have led the way in the career of rational well-regulated liberty, to crawl after the bigots of Europe, sucking in what they disgorge, that we may vomit it upon each other? I protest, I cannot describe my feelings whilst I write; I thought that I had flung the Atlantic between me and this necessity. I imagined that the testimony of George Washington would have had weight with the people of this Union. I did hope that the recollection of Archbishop Carroll was not blotted away altogether. I am now to be informed that Charles Carroll has forfeited the good will of his country, has betrayed his sacred honour, has snatched his pledged property from the perils of the contest for freedom, or has shamefully skulked from facing the enemies of his country in the day when his services were needed. No! we will be told there is a sufficient explanation of this.

"The only reason why, among Papists, there are many good *Subjects of Protestant Governments* arises from the fact, that there are so many in the Roman Church inconsistent with their profession, better than their profession; having no idea of all the doctrines and *All Enormous Corruptions* of the Faith which they acknowledge."

And pray, sirs, call you this a compliment? "Sir, you profess a faith having enormous corruptions." We shall not now stop to examine the theology of men who could use such an expression as "corrupt faith," just as accurate as "a false truth." "But, Mr. Carroll, you are a good man, but a very ignorant man; and the reason you are good, is because you are ignorant; for, sir, if your conduct and your belief

were to be consistent, you would be a very bad man." I really must repeat, I know not how to write upon so disgusting a collection of arrogant insulting calumny. I must pause to ask, What has provoked it? I do know many virtuous, amiable, excellent Protestants. I believe the doctrines of their church to be erroneous in many instances. But if I know myself, I would sooner be deprived of my tongue or of my fingers, than address to any one of them such a gross insult. I do not know, I never did know any Protestant friend of mine to be as good as his church taught him to be. His church teaches a very high and exalted morality. And when, in a friendly way, I discuss with him topics of doctrine, I do not find it necessary to caluminate and to insult him. If Mr. Hawley and his associates have no better foundation for the support of their system than the ignorance or vice of some of those men to whom their Protestant neighbours would give honourable testimony for virtue and information, their base is tottering indeed.

But, sirs, what do you mean by calling America a Protestant country? Do you mean a Protestant Episcopalian country? Do you mean to insinuate that the government of America must be Protestant? Do you mean to insinuate, no papists shall be allowed to live under these Protestant governments? If this be not your meaning your argument is worth nothing, for your statement is, that "Papists cannot be good *subjects of Protestant governments.*" I know of only two Protestant governments in the United States, viz., New Jersey and North Carolina. Yet in those states are to be found some Roman Catholic citizens who are amongst the best informed and most meritorious citizens of our Union; men beloved and respected by their Protestant fellow-citizens; and I would not so far insult them, as to say their oaths would be considered as good a pledge as would the Rev. Wm. Hawley's. Thank God, sirs, I know many of the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who will be amongst the first to clip your wings should you aspire to create an established church or a dominant church; and, sirs, you must be reminded, that Congress has no power to make any law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This is then, sirs, as much a Presbyterian country, as much a Baptist country, as much a Unitarian country, as much a country of the Israelite, and of the Roman Catholic, and of the Methodist, as it is of the High Churchman. The Israelite in the desert often longed for the flesh-pots of Egypt, and loathed the manna, for it was very light food; he complained that the days were gone by, when he used to eat bread to the full,—yet he preferred slavery to his Egyptian masters, who fed him well, to going out in the desert in the freedom of a child of God. But

repining is now useless, good sirs; we have passed through the Red Sea; Pharaoh and his hosts have been overthrown, a nobler destiny awaits us,—the yoke of our bondage has been cast off; and, perhaps, you would consider it an aggravation of blasphemy to add to the imaginary curses of the Vatican, one other curse against him who would lay it upon us again.

Good sirs, I have imperfectly given you a faint outline of your portrait. I shall proceed to fill up this piece so as to exhibit you as well as my few moments of leisure will permit. I shall discharge you from this day's sitting.

Your devoted servant,

A Catholic Clergyman,

A Native of Ireland.

LETTER II.

Charleston, S. C., Dec. 10, 1824.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—Your libel upon my religion and my native country, consists of a text and a comment:—the text purports to be an extract from Pearson's *Life of Hey*; the comment is your own production. The text is a misrepresentation of facts; and in your comment you add falsehood, calumny and bad logic, to a most uncharitable exhibition of your zeal against Popery, as you are pleased to call the religion of nearly, if not fully, two hundred millions of the present inhabitants of the world. These, sirs, are plain, and strong, and by some perhaps will be considered bold assertions, others, it is probable, will give them a less courteous appellation; but I shall prove their truth or be content to assume the place which I now give you. Recollect, sirs, that this is your own seeking, not mine. Our writers left you unmolested—but you barked at our doors, you snapped at us as we passed along, you grinned, you snarled, and you growled as if we were thieves, and you the protectors of the national rights of America. Mark your words:—

"If ever the Romish Church should be sufficiently powerful in this country, nothing but a loose attachment to her essential principles will prevent its members from seizing the *Torch and Scourge of Persecution*, and illuminating our benighted land with as many *Fires for Our Burning*, as ever blazed amidst the Protestants of France."

Sirs, I would freely give more than you would, that you had never published this passage—*facilis descensus Averni*. Your pen was certainly dipped in gall when you wrote it; and unless fully true, and you certain of its truth, was it not a most uncharitable exhibition of your

zeal against the *Romish Church*, to have written it? Of what Catholics would do at a future period, sirs, you could not be certain, unless you were gifted with the spirit of prophecy, and as you very modestly and very properly lay aside all claim to those gifts promised by our Saviour in the *Gospel of Mark* xvi 17, to the church of true believers, you cannot be suspected of this miraculous accompaniment more than of the power of healing the sick. Was it not then an uncharitable exhibition of zeal against our religion to attempt to rouse the prejudices of our fellow-citizens against us, upon the mere surmise of what our successors might possibly do hereafter?

Good sirs, have you ever read of the Abingdom law described by *Heraclitus ridens* which was, first to hang a man and then to try him? Or have you read of the Lifford law in Ray's *Proverbs*:

> That hang and draw,
> Then hear the cause by Lifford law.

Sir Roger L'Estrange mentions in his *Apol.* page 3, that when he was imprisoned for his unsuccessful attempt upon Lyn-Regis in 1644, because Miles, the Judge Advocate, had not time to prepare the charges against him for the day originally fixed for the trial, he was like to be hanged first and tried after, upon a charge which would be brought. And since I must avow my profanity, I have heard that in a play a certain Caleb Quotem, wishing to go to a review, whips all his pupils in the morning so as to pay them beforehand for their earning during the future part of the day, that he might have leisure to see the soldiers without being indebted to the children. Apropos! Was not Mr. Hawley a captain who marched to a review near Canada? Just so, the Roman Catholics of the United States are to be delivered over to the execration of their fellow-citizens, because it is possible that their descendants, will burn future Protestants. Would it not be well to draw the horoscope of infants again, so as to spare the sheriffs the painful duty of hanging culprits, and judges and juries the loss of time in holding trials—for, all future malefactors could with facility be killed and buried at less expense when only one day old, than in manhood. Two great advantages more would thus be secured. The crimes would be prevented, the golden age would return: and it would only be necessary to baptize the infants to secure their salvation, whereas our black-coated gentry undergo great labour to convert the gallows into a path to Paradise.

O! I would that you had never written the passage! not because it makes the church of the feminine gender in one line "her essential principles," and of the neuter gender in the next "prevent its members;"

for, no person expects to find more than a semblance of English in your monthly compilations. You have not the privilege of a daily journalist, nor of a weekly publisher, whom the devil frequently torments into inaccuracy. Neither have you room to plead want of time for reflection. You have an entire month to concoct your doses. Your work is done with deliberation, and if with malice, it is malice prepense. The source of my regret is the transient pain which our readers must feel at perusing what you have forced me to write in self-defence. But they may rest satisfied that before it is inflicted upon them, it is endured by me. To you the knowledge of this may be a gratification; few, however, will envy you its enjoyments.

But to return. Is it not a most uncharitable exhibition of zeal in you, to hold us forth to public execration for crimes not yet committed, and which perhaps no one of us ever intended to commit? Your answer is, that our essential principles necessarily lead to the commission of the crime. We deny it. Our essential principle is "that we are bound to believe what God teaches and to obey God's commandments." This is the sole principle of the Roman Catholic religion: this is its essential principle: it has no other. All its doctrines, all its practices, must be conformable to this principle—they are nothing more than the application of evident facts to this simple principle. Thus if the Romish Church, as you politely style us, calls upon a person to believe a special doctrine, it is only by virtue of this principle. "Believe the doctrine of transubstantiation: not because I can demonstrate to you by natural philosophy that the substance is changed, and the appearances still continue the same as they were before the change." No, no! This is not her address. "But, because I will demonstrate to you that God revealed that such a change would be made by him in the circumstances which I prove to you are here found." Thus she says: "If you calumniate your unoffending neighbor grievously, and publicly, and repeatedly, you cannot pass unpunished, unless you repent and retract: for, I will show you that God commanded you not to be a calumniator, and declared he would punish you, if you transgressed, and farther, that he declared you would not be pardoned unless you repented, and still more, that your repentance would be delusive unless you made reparation for the injury which you inflicted." Roman Catholics have no other principle essential or accidental in their whole series of doctrine and discipline but the above single principle. No Roman Catholic pretends to say that his conduct is as perfect as the principle—but he will say that every deviation from the principle is more or less criminal, and that his Church, so far from sanctioning those deviations, unhesitatingly and un-

sparingly condemns each and every one of them. Thus you and others style her bigoted, because she will not assert, that man is not bound to believe all that God reveals, and say that every man may receive or reject revelated truths as he pleases; or because when she has full evidence, which satisfies her that God revealed a special doctrine, she will not assert that it is a matter of perfect indifference whether man believes that special doctrine or denies it. Thus others who do not like to be too tightly bound up by precepts are kind enough to call her tyrannical and bigoted, because when she sees full evidence that God gave a certain precept, she asserts that he gave it, and that it is necessary to observe it. Others again tax her with being inimical to the improvement of the human mind, and too antiquated to be fashionable; because she says: "I possess evidence that eighteen hundred years ago, God commanded this practice to be observed until the end of the world, and it is but a development of this doctrine which he then revealed. But the truth of the revelation and the divine origin of the practice were both denied one thousand three hundred and fifty years since. Solemn investigation was made and it was fully proved, decided, and recorded, that the revelation was given by God, and that the practice was by him instituted; here is an authentic copy of the record then; here are the proofs upon which the decision was had; here is evidence that the same was received and acted upon with almost unanimity, until, about two hundred and fifty years since, such persons in such a place again denied those facts and doctrines and ridiculed the practice as superstitious and childish, and told us that the production of our musty records, was but enslaving the free mind of man."

Sirs, we have but one essential principle—we believe what God has revealed, we care not how long it is since the revelation was made, provided the fact be proved. We obey God's commands. We only look for the proof of the fact, that he did give the precept; we will not try its reasonableness at the tribunal of our weak intellect, but we will examine the testimony by which the fact is upheld. We have no other principle. Now, sirs, we do not believe that God has either revealed or commanded that we should, if we had power, burn you, nor that our successors should burn your successors. Therefore, it was a most uncharitable exhibition of your zeal against Popery, to assert this calumnious falsehood—that our essential principles would urge us to burn you. Why should you be so much afraid of fire?

> "The quirks and cavils thou dost make,
> Are false and built upon mistake —
> And I shall bring you, with your pack

Of fallacies, t' *Elenchi* back,
And put your arguments in mood,
And figure, to be understood;
I'll force you by right Ratiocination,
To leave your *Vitiligitigation*,
And make you keep to the question close,
And argue, *Dialeticos.*''

Our essential principles, then, good sirs, neither put torches nor scourges into our hands. And you ought to have known, at least, so much, for you are doctors in divinity. However,

''That petticoat about your shoulders
Does not so well become a soldier's.''

But I shall be told, your principles are known, not by your professions, but by your acts, and we charge you with holding the principle, ''that no oath can bind you to heretics.'' Now, sweet sirs, we deny that we hold any such principles, and we trust you will not make the practical blunder which your friends at the other side of the Atlantic have made, in the philosophic and enlightened eighteenth century, and which they continue in the nineteenth. Mark the wisdom and philosophy evinced by the British Parliament at the instigation of some wise men of Gotham and some learned Thebans, who were seated in dignity upon her Episcopal bench. ''The Papists,'' says some venerable Christian prelate, a light of the age, ''do not believe that they ought to keep any oaths which they swear to us; to remedy this, I would at least counsel your lordships to make them swear that they will not perjure themselves.'' ''His Grace of Canterbury has outdone Solomon in wisdom, and well becomes his lawn,'' adds my Lord of Winchester, ''but I would suggest that, to guard against his using a Papal dispensation, which he might have already obtained—for, my lords, our lot has been cast in Antichristian times—as also to foreclose the possibility of his hereinafter procuring such dispensation, which might absolve him from the observance of such oath, it would please your lordships to add to the oath another clause, to the intent that the said Papist hath not already obtained, and will not hereinafter apply for, and if transmitted to him will not use any dispensation of the Bishop of Rome, relieving him from the pacts, covenants, promises, and obligations of his oath.'' Admirable wisdom! Profound philosophy! Consistent legislation! No oath can bind these Papists. The remedy is simple—make them swear to observe their oaths! ! ! But after a Papist takes the oath, he can procure a dispensation from the Pope. Make him swear that he will not use the dispensation! But the Pope will dispense with this third oath. Make him swear again not to use that second dispensation! He has got a new dispensa-

tion from this last oath. "Miserable Papist, what are we to do with you? We cannot believe your oath. You will swear anything to serve your purpose. That horrible old man, Antichrist, will give you leave to forswear and to swear! Come, put an end to the difficulty at once—swear as we all do, and be d——." [62] Good sirs, do not start; I am not so wicked—"and be done with it." Swear the oath of supremacy. "No, for I do not believe its propositions; I would be a perjurer." But we are heretics in your opinion, and you know it is a principle of your church, that no oath can bind you to heretics; and besides, you can get the dispensation after the oath, or before it if you prefer it: you can have the dispensation in your pocket whilst you swear.

Now, sirs, I put it to you in sober sadness. Do not the facts prove that we are a calumniated people? Do not the facts prove the absurdity of British legislation? If we were what the bishops of the Church of England have so often proclaimed us to be—is their wisdom greater than that of the Indian who placed the world on the back of an elephant, forgetting to examine upon what the elephant himself should stand? O! what an outcry against Popish ignorance, and Romish folly, and tyrannical bigotry, and remorseless cruelty, would be made if those prelates were in holy orders of the Roman Catholic Church! But they being good English parliamentary bishops, we should even put a cloud under the elephant's feet, to enable him to travel round the sun as softly and as much at ease as if he was moving upon woolsacks.

But Pearson, in his *Life of Hey*, adduces facts which prove that the Romish Church, that is Papists, that is well-informed adherents of Popery, that is men who have studied and been well educated, men of intellect,—none of your *profanum vulgus*, none of your rabble, but the good consistent Romish people, Romish Americans, for instance—such men as Archbishop Carroll—to prove that those men hold it as a principle, "that no oath to heretics is binding." As for such poor wretches as the ignorant Irish Papists, they are so brutish in their ideas, and such dolts, that it is impossible to teach them this sublime doctrine.

Having no idea of all the doctrines, all the enormous corruptions of the faith they acknowledge.

Thus, ignorance is now a blessing, because the more ignorant a man is of the principles of his religion, the more moral will he be. Call you this Christianity?

[62] This is undoubtedly one of the passages which Bishop England would have wished to erase, if he had revised his works with his own hand. We have preferred to leave it, however, untouched, lest we might seem to have taken undue liberties with the text of our author.

When I saw the wondrous quotation from Pearson's *Life of Hey*, I looked upon my cause as lost. Pearson—Pearson—Hey—Hey. Was there not a Bishop Pearson? asked I of a gentleman whom I met. Was he not a holy father, or a professor of divinity, or at least some person who wrote upon theological subjects? I could find no one to give me information. I went to a very respectable bookseller. "Pray, Mr. ——, do you know such a work as Pearson's *Life of Hey*?" "Yes, sir." "Have you got it?" "No, sir." "Do you know who has?" "I believe it is in the Medical Library." "What should bring it there?" "Sir, it is its most natural place." "And do our physicians study theology?" "No, sir; Pearson was not a theologian." "What then was he?" "A surgeon." "A surgeon!—Who was Hey?" "A surgeon." "What in the name of wonder sends Mr. Hawley of Washington and his compeer to study theology in a surgeon's biography?" "I cannot tell, sir. But I believe Surgeon Hey, who was, I think, an Englishman, and lived at Liverpool, was considered to be a religious man. I think he was an Evangelical." "Are you certain he was not a Roman Catholic?" "I am quite positive he was not." "Nor Surgeon Pearson?" "Not at all." "So, so, it is from surgeons Mr. Hawley learns his theology. Do you think the book is in the Medical Library?" "Yes, sir."

I next met a medical friend. "Do you know, Doctor, whether Pearson's *Life of Hey* is in the Medical Library?" "I am not certain. But," continues my friend, archly smiling, "what can you now be seeking for?" "I want to learn some theology." "Theology! Bless me! I thought you looked upon us doctors to be a set of infidels." "Not I. I have just been told that there are Evangelical surgeons who write falsehoods, and my curiosity is quite on the *qui vive*. Do let me see Pearson." My search was fruitless. I could not find the surgeon from whom you have learned to charge Catholics with holding a principle which they do not hold. But it soon struck me that you, good sirs, might have some reason connected with your theology for studying surgery. I recollected that Surgeon Pearson or Surgeon Hey might be preferable to invisible physicians, for teaching where the liver lay, and giving some information on the subject of discharge of the contents of non-existent abscesses;[63] and I cannot tell how my vision was strengthened, but so it was, that not even the "star-spangled banner" could hide from my view your figures, as you anxiously counted your works of anatomy and surgeons' biography, to try if you could discover some new mode of proving impossibilities. This, good sirs, may be one of those day-dreams in

[63] See account of Miss Mattingly's cure, in Part V.

which we all occasionaly indulge. But it struck me, as you could not make the surgeons say all that you wished, you were satisfied to make the most of what you found. But, sirs, poor indeed would have been the value of those gentlemen's surgical knowledge, unless it exceeded in correctness the specimen which you have given us of their historical information. To prove this shall be my task in my next letter. Believe me to be, good sirs, for the present, Devotedly yours,

A Catholic Clergyman,
A Native of Ireland.

LETTER III.

Charleston, S. C., Dec. 17, 1824.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—I recollect having once witnessed the protest of an old gentleman, who complained of serious injury having been done to him, and was answered by those whom he charged with its infliction, that he had no cause of complaint because they had sworn to each other that they would give him no redress; and that it was a gross crime in him to expect that they should become perjurers for his gratification. It may be well to examine the supposed facts of this case. The old gentleman was guardian to minors whose property consisted chiefly of rent-charges upon the estates of several persons who lived in the same vicinity, and through whose lands the old gentleman himself had a right of passage, with liberty to cut timber, and to work mines, and to carry away the produce. The proprietors began to quarrel among themselves, and wasted each other's property. Moved by his duty to his wards, by his feelings of benevolence, and even his self-interest, the old gentleman used his influence to bring about reconciliation. Some of them proposed as the only mode of effecting this, that he should relinquish his own rights and those of his wards—and leave them to fight out until one should be vanquished. Others thought this unjust, and proposed to reinstate him in his rights and to pay the arrears of the rent-charges, and to turn out of possession the persons who first called upon them to stop the payments, but at length they began seriously to consider of peace, as they were tired of war, and they found the principal obstacle to be who should pay the expenses. Again it was proposed to sequester part of the rent-charges, and to appropriate some of the produce of the mines to this purpose; so that all who fought should be indemnified, and the old man and his wards be made to pay for their benefit. The old gentleman pro-

tested from day to day, and still from day to day they continued to make their arrangements upon the principle of fixing the whole of their expenses, and the amount of bribes and presents upon the property in his charge. Some fearing that others would not be easily induced to oppose his claims if they should proceed to the spoliation, proposed to establish the bond of a mutual oath on all the parties to abide by their common decision, and especially not to yield to the claims of the old gentleman.

The treaty was made, the parties swore to its observance, and they refused the chief part of the rent-charge, obstructed the passage, and took away the produce of the mines, and then divided the plunder amongst them, after which they kindly sent a messenger to inform their old neighbour, that they had settled all their differences, were good friends, and hoped they had gratified him by making peace. He complained of injuries done to him, and required redress. They sent their best respects, that they had sworn to abide by the terms which they had made, and he was, it seems, so ill advised as to write a letter, in which he published to them and to the world, that this oath could not bind them to plunder him, and that it was null and void, and that those persons who originally exerted themselves to strip him of every thing, his sworn enemies, were its contrivers, and that this oath ought not to be kept to gratify them, but that he ought to have his rights restored.

You can have no objection, sirs, to try this case by the principles of Archdeacon Paley, who was a dignitary of the English Church, by law established.

The oath taken by those peace-makers was a promissory oath; an oath by which they promised to each other to observe the stipulations of their treaty. The Archdeacon says, in his treatise of *Moral Philosophy*, chapter xvi. part v. "Promissory oaths are not binding, where the promise itself would not be so: for the several cases of which, see the chapter of Promises." This is chapter v. in part iii. of which we read: "Promises are not binding where the performance is impossible." He follows on to explain:

"1. But observe that the promiser is guilty of a fraud if he be secretly aware of the impossibility, at the time of making the promise. For when any one promises a thing, he asserts his belief, at least of the possibility of performing it; as no one can accept or understand a promise under any other supposition. Instances of this sort are the following: The minister promises a place, which he knows to be engaged, or not at his disposal. A father in settling marriage articles, promises to leave his daughter an estate which he knows to be entailed upon the heir male of his family."

Now, in the case alluded to or supposed, it was impossible for the contracting parties to fulfil their promise without being guilty of injus-

tice; and in morality, that which cannot be done justly, is impossible, because it is impossible to be moral and at the same time unjust. Thus, although it was physically possible for those conspirators to plunder the claimant: still it was impossible in morality; they could not bind each other by an oath to do injustice, for an oath is not a bond of iniquity; the claimant then could fairly and properly and conscientiously answer them: Your pretext is frivolous, your object is bad, your oath is no bond, you ought not to observe it: shall I lose my claim to what is mine, because you swear to do what you cannot justly do? Shall it be in the power of a confederation of villains to create a good title for themselves to the property of honest people by merely combining to seize upon what they please, and then partitioning their plunder and swearing that they will abide by their regulations? And shall the plundered sufferer, who says their perjury and rapine are bad titles to his property, be taunted with the imputation and caring nothing for the sanctity of an oath, and branded as too impious to be permitted to live, in civil society, because he cries out that an oath is not a bond of iniquity?

Now, most wise and learned sirs, can you show any difference between the value of an oath by which a man promises to give to his daughter that which belongs to her brother's son, and of an oath by which two men who commit robbery, guarantee to each other the property which they have stolen? Will the title of the robber be better than the title of the father? I conjure you then, by all the regard which you have for your reputation as sound divines; as you would avoid the vile sneers of wicked passengers in New York steamboats; as you respect the authority of the venerable Archdeacon of a Church like yours, and as you value the maxims of common sense of good morality, to come into this conclusion, "That an old gentleman who has been plundered of what are *bona fide* his rights, or of what he conscientiously believes to be his rights, by confederates, who swear, not to restore these real or imaginary rights, may believe an oath to be a most holy and solemn bond, at the same time that he asserts that those confederates have been guilty of injustice, and that their oath is not binding."

Now, kind sirs, having found our principle, let us apply it to our facts. Your Surgeon Theologian informs us:

"When the Emperor and Roman Catholic Princes of Germany concluded the treaty of Westphalia with the Protestant Princes, they mutually bound each other, by a solemn oath, to the observance of it. On which Pope Innocent X. published a Bull, pronouncing the oath to be null and void: as no oath could bind them to heretics."

So writes Surgeon Pearson, we take your word for it, we have not seen the Surgeon's book. *Imprimis* then, I deny that this is true. I state

that the Pope is here grossly misrepresented: not so much by the first part of the statement being false, as by a false colouring having been laid upon the whole transaction.

Now, sirs, this Pope is the identical old gentleman whom I described before; and this holy alliance of Westphalia was the confederation; and the negotiators were the plunderers: and the Pope declared the oath to be not binding because it was a promissory oath, and a promissory oath would not be binding, where the promise would not, and the promise would be null and void where it could not be fulfilled without committing injustice; and the Pope declared that by this treaty of Westphalia, great injustice was done to him and to his wards, and that any oath to do this injustice was null and void. The principle of the nullity of the oath then, was injustice of the promise, and not the heretical quality of some of the plunderers. Other Popes had declared similar oaths to be null and void, long before such special heresies were instituted, upon the same principle, and when the oaths were taken by Catholics to Catholics.

Now, learned sirs, I call upon you to produce the Bull, for you know Surgeon Pearson's hearsay cannot be admitted instead of documentary evidence, when the question at issue is the moral character of two hundred millions of persons, and the moral character of their predecessors during eighteen centuries, and of their successors in all future times. The charge is made upon the essential principles of the Roman Catholic Church, which, as you very truly observe, never change. Now, charitable sirs, to convict such a dock full of prisoners, even your own counsellor would tell you something more than the vague, unsworn statement of an Evangelical anatomist would be required. Do, sirs, take the Bull at once by the horns; show courage here at least. You who dared all the familiars of the Inquisition, and dauntlessly exposed yourselves to fires which your fancy painted, to be tied with unfelt cords to imaginary stakes: come forward and seize this Bull. I promise you his horns are not as sharp as British bayonets; my country has given me perhaps the privilege of an acquaintance, and of an exhibition to which you are not entitled. I may play here safely, and you cannot, the Bull is harmless. But, sirs, do you keep away, for the Bull will hurt you, because of the very harmlessness: and still more, I am greatly afraid that a pair of surgeons could not heal the wounds which you have already received.

What in the name of prudence urged you to this bull-fight? Was it the suggestion of a friend of mine?

> "So Spanish Heroes with their lances,
> At once wound bulls, and ladies' fancies,

And he acquires the noblest spouse
That widows greatest herds of cows;
Then what may I expect to do,
Wh' have quell'd so great a buffalo?''

Let me, good sirs, try what other principle we may agree upon before I bring forward other facts.

Pray, sirs, whose property is the estate of Trinity Church in New York? Do you think the Governors of the several States could legally deprive your trustees of that property and divide it between themselves? What would you say to the Popish Priest, who is delegate to Congress from Michigan,[64] if he had the audacity to suggest to some of the Radicals that it would be better to apply this money to national purposes than to building unnecessary churches in that city? We should then, indeed, have our ears filled with invectives against unprincipled Romish tyranny; then would the fire of wrath be enkindled, and the fires of the Inquisition would shine in flaming splendour. And why? The inviolability of property, the sanctity of charters, the limits of power. But suppose the Governors, or the Congress seized upon the revenues and swore a solemn oath, never to give it back. Of course, good sirs, you would have such respect for the inviolability of an oath, especially if it had been taken at the suggestion of this Romish American deputy to Congress, that you would support your bereavement in resignation; and even if the despoilers felt some qualms of conscience and had some misgivings, and consulted you, as good divines, you would tell them: '' 'Tis true you robbed our church, but you swore to keep the plunder; your oath is registered in heaven. You must observe it. As for us: God forbid we should be partakers of sacrilege, should you violate your oaths and restore this property, we should never obtain forgiveness, did we touch one cent thereof; for it would be concurring in your perjury; from which may our good consciences defend us!'' Call you this theology? Something like it was taught by the first royal head in earth of Christ's church in Great Britain. King Henry VIII. taught it with a witness; his Vicar General Cromwell taught it: the gentle Cranmer assented thereto; the disinterested Somerset protected the principle along with Edward VI.; Elizabeth was not impoverished thereby; and it was most religiously acquiesced in by all the bishops whom she and her Parliament made. However, the doctrine has been somewhat antiquated—*tempora mutantur*. It is branded with little less, perhaps I ought to say a little more than the stamp of heresy by his grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England;

[64] Rev. Mr. Richard.

by his grace, the Lord Archbishop of York, Primate of England; by his grace the Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate of all Ireland; by his grace, the learned and conciliating, the grave, tolerant Lord Archbishop of Dublin, Primate of Ireland; by his grace the Lord Archbishop of Cashel; by his grace the Lord Archbishop of Tuam; by his Majesty's Cabinet Ministers; by his Majesty's Lord High Chancellor of that part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, called Ireland, and by the Right Honourable William Conyngham Plunket, his Majesty's Attorney General of the same; and by all those members of the British House of Commons who, in the present year, accused Mr. Joseph Hume of the most sacrilegious criminality for daring to inquire whether the Protestant Bishops and Clergy of Ireland could not live on less than one-fifth of the land, though their flocks did not constitute the one-tenth of the population. Therefore, sweet sirs, you will not consider me profane, if I conclude that it is not abhorrent to the principles of the Protestant Church of England, to say that church property is inviolable, equally as private property. That it is also perfectly compatible with the principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America to assert, that church property which is legally recognised, is to be sacredly preserved for the purposes to which it is destined, and cannot be applied to any other; nor is it lawful to seize upon it by force, or to usurp the same.

So far is it recognised as a principle in the State of South Carolina, that it has been decided upon appeal in Equity, that where a Protestant Episcopal Church had certain revenues, and was for many years vacant, and no minister of that church could be had, and some of the Parishoners invited a Presbyterian Clergyman to officiate, he could not, upon the principle of *cy pres* or doing what came nearest to the object for which the fund was created, receive a salary therefrom, because it was created for a Protestant Episcopalian, and not for a Presbyterian; and the court could not in Equity permit a fund sacred to one purpose to be given for a different purpose. It would be unjust to divert the fund from the purpose of its creation.

Let us then in the name of consistency give the Pope leave to hold the same opinion respecting church property of the Romish Church, that English Protestants hold respecting the property of the English Church; that American Protestants and American Courts of Equity do respecting the property of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Let us give Innocent X. the benefit of the principle now established, and by the application of obvious facts to this principle, we shall come to the proper result.

The question now is, whether by the treaty of Westphalia the contracting parties did against the Pope's consent, deprive him of rights which he previously had; and whether the churches under his protection and whose rights he was sworn to defend, and bound to preserve, were against his will, stripped of their rights and possessions. This is a plain question touching facts, and easily solved by history. As, however, history is rather cumbersome; you, sirs, who wish to be at your ease, dispense with its burthen, and make sumpter mules of your surgeons. You lay all the faults of your quackery upon invisible physicians, and all your historical blunders upon tangible surgeons.

To know how a question is to be solved, we should know its bearings. The rights which the German churches possessed, were the right to hold the property bestowed for religious purposes—the right to have the offices filled by persons having the qualifications required by the donors, and the right of having those officers appointed by the authority established and in the mode pointed out by the donors. The property was bestowed by Roman Catholics for the support of the Roman Catholic worship. The offices were to be filled by Roman Catholic clergymen of several descriptions; they were to be appointed in some instances by the Pope, in others by the chapter, in others by the bishop. The Pope had his own special rights, and was moreover guardian and protector of the rights of the bishops, of the chapters and of the churches generally; he had in Germany special rights beyond what he had in other places, arising from two causes, viz.—1. He was the creator of that Empire. 2. The Emperor was bound by several treaties to preserve those special, peculiar and eminent privileges and rights, and to prevent any infringement of them or of any of them. But in the treaty of Westphalia, he did grossly infringe upon them. Your own Archdeacon (Paley) says, chapter VI. part iii. section 3, *Moral Philosophy*, "Promises are not binding when they contradict a former promise. Because the performance is then unlawful." The first promise of the Emperors was to protect and to preserve the rights of the church. To observe this, they were sworn at their coronation. The first treaties of the Emperor were to maintain the rights of the See of Rome. It was for this purpose the Empire was originally created. Therefore, a promise at the time of the treaty of Westphalia was subsequent to those promises; and would be unlawful if it contradicted them, and Archdeacon Paley says it would not be binding even if confirmed with an oath, for "Promissory oaths are not binding where the promise itself would not be so."

Now, good sirs, I put it to you as Divines: is it lawful to take

away from Trinity Church, New York, its funds and to convert them to the repairing of the Cumberland Road, or to the fortifying of Point Comfort? Or would the Rev. Mr. Hawley or the Rev. Mr. McIlvaine consent to the lawfulness of appropriating the income of their churches to the defraying of the expenses of the City of Charleston, in the entertainment of General La Fayette? Now, Archdeacon Paley tells us that "promises are not binding when the performance is unlawful." Suppose our friend Captain Carbery, whom you abused for being asleep when his sister was cured, was again elected by his fellow citizens to be Mayor of Washington, and that he swore the income of one of your churches should be appropriated to the procuring of a good mansion house for the mayor of the federal city, would you give up the money, rather than permit him to be esteemed a perjurer? Suppose a good, warm-hearted, foolish countryman of mine were to swear an oath that you should not quit his table until you were drunk, would you be obliged to become intoxicated lest he should be a perjurer? I hope this will not be found your maxim of morality.

The principle of law, the principle of morality is prior to this oath. Listen to your own Archdeacon:

"The parties in those cases are not obliged to perform what the promise requires, because they were under a prior obligation to the contrary. From which prior obligation what is to discharge them? Their promise — their own act and deed. But the obligation, from which a man can discharge himself by his own act, is no obligation at all. The guilt therefore of such promises lies in the making not in the breaking of them; and if in the interval betwixt the promise and the performance, a man so far recover his reflection, as to repent of his engagements, he ought certainly break through them."

However, learned sirs, as you perhaps will not be satisfied with a mere Archdeacon of the English Church, it may be as well to give you the doctrine of the pure days of King Edward VI., with the approbation of her majesty Queen Elizabeth, who committed the crime of living in single blessedness, you probably know as well as I do what is meant, *cum grano salis*. The Homilies have authority from the ratification of the thirty-nine articles, together with the acceptation of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America:

No. 7. *Sermon of Swearing*, part 2, paragraph 2: But if a man shall at any time, either of ignorance, or of malice, promise and swear to do anything which is against the law of Almighty God, or not in his power to perform, let him take it for an unlawful and ungodly oath.

Last Paragraph.

And finally ye have heard how damnable a thing it is either to forswear ourselves, or to keep an unlawful and unadvised oath.

However, sirs, as Pope Innocent X. had not the benefit of Dr. Paley's

learning, it may be no harm to see by what light he was guided. I shall therefore make a few quotations from Popish authors whom his Holiness could have consulted, and in such dark times those little scintillations might have sufficed; though British divines might have been as much in error, as to the value of their authority as the British soldiers were during the last war, respecting the nature of fire-flies, when their scouts mistook them for sparks from flints preparing for the rifles which were to send them to a world of spirits. We will, however, take one or two passages:

"Some things are good under all circumstances, such as works of virtue, and such good things might be vowed or promised to be done. Other things are bad under all circumstances: such as things naturally sinful. And they can never be made the matter of a vow, or of a promise. There are also some things which considered abstractedly are good, and under this view they may be the matter of a vow or of a promise. But under certain circumstances they may lead to a bad result; and in this view they can not be the matter of a vow or of a promise. . . . . Thus St. Jerome says of Jeptha, he was a fool in making a vow imprudently, and he was impious in its fulfilment."[65]

In his next question, article 7, *ad secundum*, St. Thomas after laying down his doctrine and its support from reason to show that a person ought not to observe an oath which appeared to bind to the performance of an unlawful or sinful act, produces the testimony of St. Ambrose, in those words: "It is sometimes against duty to fulfil your promise, to keep your oath: as when Herod put John to death, lest he should not fulfil what he had sworn." You know, sirs, St. Thomas, and St. Jerome, and St. Ambrose, and all those writers of my church were fanatics and poor ignorant creatures, who knew nothing of the mariner's compass, nor of the art of printing, which Romish men, however, invented, but as they wrote a kind of monkish Latin, which I feared you could not understand, I gave a translation in English. Thus you will perceive, the Archdeacon of a church like yours, and my saints, have agreed upon a principle; all that remains for you and me is to find the facts and to draw the conclusion.

We have seen what rights the Pope had in Germany, or if you say these were imaginary rights, I will answer: That he considered the rights to be in him: and the Catholic princes and prelates and people believed the rights to be in him. It is true the Protestants asserted that he had no rights, and were enemies to his having any power in Germany, or elsewhere, and one of the complaints of the Pope was that the Catholics knowing the object of the Protestants to be the destruction of his rights, invaded those rights to save their own privileges and

[65] St. Thomas of Aquin, *Summa*, 2. 2d. Q. 88, A. II. *ad secundum*.

purses; thus he complained that those men were led by their heretical principles to try and bind Catholics to do him serious injustice; and he declared that any oath taken to heretics to do this injustice was not to be kept by Catholics, not because the oath was made to heretics, but because it was made to do injustice. It is, then, gross misrepresentation to publish to the world that the doctrine of the Pope is, that oaths made to heretics by Catholics are not binding. It is that fallacy which draws a general conclusion from particular premises. It is that fallacy which comes to a general conclusion from an accidental circumstance. It is faulty in several respects. Such fallacious arguments are seldom used by honest men: and when honest men use them it is only their ignorance which can plead their excuse. It is a species of sophistry highly discreditable to him who uses it; and it is that which is almost perpetually used against the Roman Catholic Church.

The Protestants of Germany made several attempts to destroy the Catholic establishments. 1. By procuring disqualified persons to be elected and installed into places for which only Catholics were qualified. 2. By placing Protestant laics in the places founded for Catholic clergymen. 3. By procuring frequently by force and oftener by fraud, the secularization of Church property. What would you say, good sirs, to the Roman Catholics, of this Union, did they pretend to be Protestants, and get elected upon the vestries of your churches, for the purpose of disposing of their revenues in a way injurious to your religion and beneficial to their own? What would you say to them if they appointed Catholic laymen to fill the places of your pastors and kept them by force in those places, permitting them to hire Protestant clergymen at trifling salaries to go through the duties badly and irregularly, and pocketing large profits in the amount of difference between receipts and expenditures? What, if the Catholics had your chartered property seized upon and converted to the public purposes of the state, or divided amongst themselves? Yet of such a nature you will learn from the Protestant Archdeacon Coxe, were the facts in Germany. You may, if you will, say that Popery is error, but does his error destroy the Papist's right to his property? To the offices of his own church and to their income?

It is time to come now to the treaty of Westphalia. It was signed at Osnaburg on the 6th of August, and at Munster on the 8th of September, 1648, after a negotiation of two years. The Protestant powers together with Sweden met at Osnaburg under the mediation of Denmark. France, Spain, and the Catholic powers met at Munster under the mediation of the Pope. At a very early period of the negotiations, Chigi,

the Nuncio of Innocent X. protested against the injustice to the Papal See and the German churches; and withdrew. He succeeded Innocent in the Papacy by the name of Alexander VII. The negotiators foresaw the opposition which would be given by the parties whose rights they knew they were destroying. See what your own Archdeacon writes in his history of the house of Austria.

"As the protests of the Pope and the King of Spain were foreseen, a particular clause, expressed in the strongest and most precise terms, established these treaties as a perpetual law, and pragmatic sanction, and declared null and ineffectual all opposition made by any ecclesiastic or secular prince either within or without the empire."

There was besides this a special compliment paid to the Pope quite in the Lutheran fashion at that day, of placing him in a stipulation of treaty in that company which it was thought it was most appropriate. Your Archdeacon gives it to us in these words.

"The principal contracting parties were allowed to include their allies, if nominated within a certain period, and received by common consent; and the different powers specified under the sanction of this article, comprised all the European states, except the Pope and the Turkish Sultan."

We shall now see the church property, which was conveyed away to indemnify the belligerents, and the whole church property of the several denominations in the United States, is far less than the Catholic Church was stripped of by this treaty:

"Sweden obtained, the Archbishopric of Bremen secularized and converted into a duchy.

"The Bishopric of Verden secularized and converted into a principality.

"The Elector of Brandenburg, in return for part of Pomerania, ceded to Sweden, obtained the Archbishopric of Madgeburgh, secularized and converted into a duchy.

"The Bishopric of Halberstadt, converted into a principality.

"The Bishopric of Minden, converted into a principality.

"The Bishopric of Cammin, converted into a principality.

"The house of Brunswick Luneberg, in return for the patronage in the Catholic Church, lost by his leaving the Catholic religion, received the property of the converts of Walkenrid and Groningen, and the alternate possession for one of the younger sons of the house of Hanover, of the revenues of the Bishopric of Osnabruck, the Bishop, a Roman Catholic, to have the alternation. By virtue of this clause, his Royal Highness, Frederick, Duke of York and Albany, and heir-apparent to the British throne, has received the income to the see of Osnabruck, during the last sixty-one years, leaving the Catholics to find some way of supporting their church, without the income left by their predecessors for that purpose. (What says Mr. Hawley to this?)

"The Duke of Mecklenburg received the Bishopric of Schwerin, converted into a secular principality.

"The Bishopric of Ratzeburg, converted into a principality.

"Two commanderies of the religious order of Knights of St. John.

"William, Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, who had no claim whatever for satisfaction or indemnity, because he had suffered no loss: by the support of the Swedes, and because his father was one of the first German princes who joined Gustavus Adolphus in opposition to the Catholics, obtained the princely possessions of the Abbey of Hirschfeld, as a secular domain."

Besides those special enumerations, a vast quantity of Catholic Church property was alienated indirectly by several other articles of the treaty; and a great many of the ancient and undoubted rights of the See of Rome and of the church were destroyed. My object is sufficiently answered by the general notion here given. I wished to show that the Pope complained steadily, constantly, and loudly, not that Catholics and Protestants made a fair treaty to enrich each other by plundering the church, and that he felt himself called upon to protest against the spoliation as an act of gross injustice, and to declare the pretext of the bond of an oath between the contracting parties to be a frivolous pretext, because the oath was not binding.

This, good sirs, is the view which the principles of morality and the facts of history give of the case. I then unhesitatingly assert, that the act of Innocent X. was not immoral, and that it is a calumny of a very gross kind to assert that he taught, or that Catholics believe, that Catholics are not bound by their oaths to heretics. It manifests either a total ignorance of facts, or a total absence of moral feeling in the writer who deliberately publishes the proposition; and now, good sirs, I leave you and Sergeant Pearson to share your well-deserved honours between you. I promise you, in my next, to make Ireland as uncomfortable to you, as Westphalia must be at present. Wishing you many happy returns of the season,

I remain, sirs,

Your devoted servant,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,

A native of Ireland.

LETTER IV.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 24, 1824.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—Some persons are of opinion that I treat you with too much severity; "for," say they, "this priest ought to make some allowance for the ignorance of facts under which the Rev. Mr. Hawley and his associates labour: these gentlemen are well disposed, but though they have studied divinity, and are zealous preachers, they have not studied

history to a sufficient extent to know all those things." Shall I admit their excuse for you, and against myself? Am I, and my religion, and my country to be held up to execration, without redress? Are Roman Catholics to be libelled with impunity? Are the great majority of the people of Ireland, and nearly a million of the respectable and best-conducted peers, baronets, gentry, merchants, and other inhabitants of Great Britain to be denounced as traitors, who are on an equal footing only with the wretched convicts who are transported to New Holland? And am I to suffer all this, merely because you are ignorant? If your advocates have no better excuse, they had better continue silent. Would to God you had been silent!! We should never have disturbed your literary somnambulism, had you not contrived to grope us out, and seize upon us for destruction. You left us no alternative. We should either, before all the citizens of the Union, acquiesce in the truth of your horrible charges, and thus acknowledge ourselves too base and too wicked to be admitted into these republics, or we should prove your intentional falsehood, or your total ignorance. You left us no choice. I differ, therefore, with your apologists, and must proceed.

Your next allegation is derived from your Doctor:

"In 1768, when an oath of allegiance to be taken by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, was in the contemplation of Parliament, containing a declaration of abhorrence of the doctrine, that faith was not to be kept with heretics, and that princes excommunicated by the Pope might be deposed or murdered: Thomas Maria Ghillini, the Pope's Legate at Brussels, made the following observations on that oath, in four letters to the Archbishops of Ireland; that these doctrines are defended by most Catholic nations, and the Holy See has frequently followed them in practice: that as the oath is in its whole extent unlawful, so in its nature it is invalid; that it can by no means bind or oblige consciences.

"It was with reference to, and to guard against these dangerous popish tenets, that the following clauses were inserted in an oath of allegiance intended to have been taken by the Roman Catholics of Ireland:

"'I do swear, that I do from my heart detest, and abjure as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that princes excommunicated by the Pope, or by any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, and so forth.'

"Before this oath could receive the sanction of the legislature, it was condemned by the vicars apostolical of the western, northern, and southern districts, in an encyclical letter addressed to all the faithful clergy and laity of those districts."

Now, sirs, I am perfectly at a loss to know whether it is upon you, or upon Surgeon Pearson, the weight of all the blunders and misrepresentations of this precious collection ought to be laid. I have not seen the Surgeon's work, from which it purports to be an extract. I do not know whether there is anything in the book to let the reader know that all this ought not to refer to Ireland; but I do know, that here it appears

to refer to the Roman Catholics of Ireland only: except so far as Legate Ghillini and the Papists at large are calumniated. I shall therefore place the whole to your debit, and you and your Surgeon will be at full liberty to settle your own accounts as you think proper.

Leaving the legate and the general imputation for awhile, let us see the other allegations: 1. You assert that the clause which you favour us with, was inserted in an oath intended to have been taken by the Roman Catholics of Ireland. 2. That it was so inserted, for the purpose of guarding against these popish tenets which you have adduced, viz.: that faith was not to be kept with heretics; and next, that princes excommunicated by the Pope, might be deposed or murdered. 3. That in 1768, Parliament contemplated framing an oath of allegiance for the Roman Catholics of Ireland, containing a declaration of abhorrence of these doctrines. 4. That this oath was condemned by the vicars apostolical of the northern, western, and southern districts, before it could receive the sanction of the legislature.

Now, good sirs, I beg leave to inform you, that each and every one of the above four propositions is a distinct falsehood: 1. The clause you adduce, was never inserted in any oath offered to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, nor in any oath intended for them by the Irish Parliament, which was their legislature at the time. 2. That [clause] not having been introduced into the oath intended for them, could not have been introduced for a special purpose. 3. In the year 1768, the Irish Parliament did not contemplate an oath of allegiance to be taken by the Roman Catholics. Lord Townshend was the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Parliament was occupied chiefly with the Octennial Bill, and that regarding the judges, until its separation in June. It did not meet again until October, 1769: and during the entire administration of this lord, which did not terminate until 1772, no question about the Roman Catholics was raised or considered of, in the legislature. 4. There were no Vicars Apostolical in Ireland, and the English Vicars Apostolical had no concern with the Irish oath, and issued no circular or encyclical letter, either in approbation or in contradiction thereof.

I might, so far as you are concerned, rest here, satisfied with having exhibited your total ignorance of facts; but my object is not to treat you as you richly deserve. I candidly avow, that from the specimens of your theological and historical knowledge which I have seen, I should be but little inclined to waste even my ink upon yourselves; but, as I feel every inclination to treat respectfully those who may read my effusions, I owe it to them, even at the hazard of being tedious, to show that I make no unfounded assertions. I shall, therefore, give as briefly as

I can, a statement of facts, and an exhibition of documents which will correct your misrepresentations.

In 1757, the Duke of Bedford was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; during many years previous, the Catholics had not only been ground down, but they suffered under a persecution worse than any bodily torture; such a persecution as you endeavour to continue—the persecution of calumny. To an upright mind, it is the worst species of infliction. I feel, at this moment, a conflict within myself which is most painful. I know the precept of forgiveness which my Redeemer obliges me to observe, and I feel the tortures of your cruel injustice. I know, the avowal will gratify you: but enjoy it. God knows I do not envy you. Yet this precept, notwithstanding, I wish you could feel as I do: the torture of being publicly vilified by ——— I shall not write what I feel. Besides brutal oppression, the Irish Catholic felt then more than I now feel, and what, if you once felt, if you had even the shred of the remnant of a heart, you would never inflict: the torture of being painted in every deformity which they detested. In that Duke my ancestors found, what notwithstanding foul falsehoods from men who preach, not to bear false witness, I found in America, a kind Protestant friend. Such an unwonted, such an unexpected, such an extraordinary discovery, gave them courage and gratitude; and the following extract from the address of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Dublin to the Laity, was an exhibition of their feelings. Read it. It is the modest remonstrance of good and persecuted men, conscious of integrity, but scarcely venturing to insinuate that they had been calumniated, though they groaned under the calumny. O! may God long preserve and fortify the principle which leaves every man in America at full liberty to reply to his defamer in language which, though perhaps too warm, is still less sereve than a defamer deserves; especially one who flings about him the mantle of religion, and calls upon his fellow-citizens, as they love God, to execrate their neighbour.

Extract from the Address to the Laity, read from the altars of the Roman Catholics of Dublin, on Sunday, Oct. 2, 1757.

"But as we have not a more effectual method of showing our acknowledgement to our temporal governors, than by an humble, peaceful, and obedient behaviour, as hitherto, we earnestly exhort you to continue in the same happy and Christian disposition, and thus by degrees you will entirely efface in their minds those evil impressions which have been conceived so much to our prejudice, and industriously propagated by our enemies. A series of more than sixty years spent with a pious resignation under the hardships of very severe penal laws, and with the greatest thankfulness for the lenity and moderation with which they were executed, ever

since the accession of the present royal family, is certainly a fact which must outweigh, in the minds of all unbiassed persons, any misconceived opinions of the doctrine and tenets of our holy church.

"You know that it has always been our constant practice as ministers of Jesus Christ, to inspire you with the greatest horror for thefts, frauds, murders, and the like abominable crimes, as being contrary to the laws of God and nature, destructive of civil society, condemned by our holy church, which so far from justifying them on the score of religion, or any other pretext whatsoever, delivers the unrepenting authors of such criminal practices over to Satan.

"We are no less zealous than ever in exhorting you to abstain from cursing, swearing, and blaspheming; detestable vices to which the poorer sort of our people are most unhappily addicted, and which must at one time or other bring down the vengeance of heaven upon you in some visible punishment, unless you absolutely refrain from them.

"It is probable, that from hence, some people have taken occasion to brand us with this infamous calumny, that we need not fear to take false oaths, and consequently to perjure ourselves, as if we believed that any power upon earth could authorize such damnable practices, or grant dispensations for this purpose. How unjust and cruel this charge is, you know by our instructions to you, both in public and private, in which we have ever condemned such doctrines, as false and impious.

"Others, likewise, may easily know it from the constant behaviour of numbers of Roman Catholics, who have given the strongest proofs of their abhorrence of those tenets, by refusing to take oaths, which, however conducive to their temporal interest appeared to them entirely repugnant to the principles of their religion."

In the year 1757, the Catholic Committee was formed, and the venerable Dr. O'Keeffe, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, and founder of the college of St. Patrick, at Carlow, previously proposed to a meeting, of which Lord Trimbleston was Chairman, a declaration of Roman Catholic tenets as regarded the calumnies with which they were assailed, and insulted, and which declaration was adopted, and signed unanimously. This declaration then, be it remembered, was drawn up by a Catholic Bishop, and proposed by a Catholic Bishop, and unanimously adopted by the Catholic Committee, and signed by clergy and laity, and sent to Rome as the authentic act and deed of an Irish Catholic Diocess, and there received without condemnation, in 1757, which was full eleven years before the period alluded to by the Surgeon.

This declaration, amongst other things, contains the following:

"Whereas, certain opinions and principles inimical to good order and government, have been attributed to the Catholics, the existence of which we utterly deny; and whereas it is at this time, peculiarly necessary to remove such imputations; and to give the most full and ample satisfaction to our Protestant brethren, that we hold no principle whatever, incompatible with our duty as men or as subjects, or repugnant to liberty, whether political, civil, or religious.

"Now we, the Catholics of Ireland, for the removal of all such imputations, and in deference to the opinion of many respectable bodies of men and individuals

among our Protestant brethren, do hereby in the face of our country, of all Europe and before God, make this our deliberate and solemn declaration:

"1st. We abjure, disavow, and condemn the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope or Council, or by any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever, may therefore be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any other persons. We hold such doctrines in detestation, as wicked and impious; and we declare that we do not believe that either the Pope, with or without a general council, or any prelate or priest, or any ecclesiastical power whatsoever, can absolve the subjects of this kingdom, or any of them, from their allegiance to his majesty King George, who is, by authority of Parliament, the lawful king of this realm.

"2d. We abjure, condemn, and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or any ways injure any person whatsoever, for, or under the pretext of being heretics; and we solemnly declare before God, that we believe no act, in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by, or under the pretence or colour that it was done either for the good of the church, or in obedience to an ecclesiastical power whatsoever.

"3d. We further declare that we hold it as an unchristian and impious principle 'that no faith is to be kept with heretics.' This doctrine we detest and reprobate, not only as contrary to our religion, but as destructive of morality, society, and even common honesty; and it is our firm belief, that an oath made to any person, not of the Catholic religion, is equally binding as if we made it to any Catholic whatsoever.

"4th. We have been charged with holding as an article of our belief, that the Pope, with or without the authority of a general council, or that certain ecclesiastical powers can acquit or absolve us before God, from our oath of allegiance or even from the just oaths and contracts entered into between man and man.

"Now, we do utterly renounce, abjure, and deny, that we hold or maintain any such belief — as being contrary to the peace and happiness of society, inconsistent with morality, and above all repugnant to the true spirit of the Catholic religion."

Now, sirs, look at this document; and if you have a particle of feeling, can you dare to ascend the pulpit of the God of truth without seeking pardon for your gross, your uncalled for libel upon a people persecuted in a manner too shocking to be related. This declaration was drawn by a Catholic Bishop, it was subscribed by the clergy and the laity, and it was registered in Rome, and published in Ireland, fully over ten, nearly eleven years before your assumed date.

The fact of Dr. Ghillini's interference, at a subsequent period, I am ready to admit and to show that it does not bear upon the question between you and me.

That question is, whether the doctrines imputed by you to the Irish Catholics, and here rejected by them were held by them. Another question will be, were they, or are they Catholic, or in your uncourteous phraseology, Popish doctrines. I will now suppose against the fact, that they were held by the legate at Brussels. My answer is as short as was that of Father O'Leary, viz., "Mr. Ghillini is not the Roman Catholic Church; he is not infallible."

The Roman Catholics were not noticed until 1773, when two bills were brought into Parliament to enable them to lend money upon mortgage and to take leases of land for lives, upon certain provisos. But both were rejected. Next year, 1774, on the 5th of March, leave was given to bring in a bill to enable them to testify their allegiance, and it passed without opposition; but it remitted no pain or penalty to which they were liable. It received the royal assent upon June second. So that in your statement of 1768, you made another mistake of six years; but, sirs, to you such inaccuracies are trifles.—Great men who are occupied in deep philosophical researches, and whose meditations are made amidst the piles of the patriarchal tomes, cannot be expected to be good chronologists—and, indeed, sirs, 1768, was a good guess for either 1757 or 1774. But the misfortune is, that the Parliament never contemplated the oath until the latter period. You ought, however, to be forgiven this mistake, I would myself warrant you will never forget the dates again.

As you may like to know the history of the oath, I shall give it to you, and you will be the more interested in it, as a truly respectable Protestant Bishop, one whose memory, Papist as I am, I respect, took a creditable part in the transaction. It will also show that you who are not Bishops, and are not — — — however, I shall not write what I think, cannot be so much blamed for ignorance upon a point on which this great and good man was for a long time unenlightened. The following is an extract from the *Life of O'Leary*, by the Reverend Thomas R. England, brother to the Bishop of Charleston (p. 53):

"The act is said to have originated from the following occurrence. — The celebrated Earl of Bristol, Bishop of Derry, whilst at dinner one day, with the professors of one of the Irish colleges in France, feelingly lamented the hard necessity, which his learned and amiable countrymen were under, of spending in foreign countries, the most valuable portion of their lives; 'still he could not see,' he added, 'why they refused to their native sovereign that allegiance and fidelity, which distinguish their conduct towards the continental monarchs, in whose dominions the Irish colleges were situated. For his part, he wished the Catholics to enjoy freedom of conscience; but until they were found to renounce the opinions generally entertained by them — opinions which militated against the lives of those whom they termed heretics, the safety of the throne, and the obligations of an oath — he could not so far forget what he owed to the peace and security of the country, as to show them any countenance there.' This declaration gave rise to a conversation of some length; in the course of which the noble guest learned the willingness of the Catholics, as stated to him, to afford every proof of temporal allegiance that could be required from subjects; and moreover, their hearty abhorrence of the opinions imputed to them of holding no faith with heretics, and of being prepared, at every intimation from their religious superiors, to trample upon the obligations of an oath. These statements were, upon his return home, circulated by his lordship among his political

friends, and as the Catholics were gradually growing on the good will of some members of the administration, the subject was very generally and freely canvassed. The late venerable Lord Taafe, Charles O'Conner, (a man whose name will ever be dear to Ireland,) Mr. Wise, of Waterford, Mr. R. Dermott, and some other gentlemen who acted as a committee for the Catholic body, after consulting with the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, drew up the form of an oath, which they professed their willingness and anxiety to take as an evidence of their loyalty, and so forth."

Such, sirs, is the history of the first declaration, and next of the oath of 1774, regarding which you made so many mistakes. It is but right now to give you a few passages from the oath itself, which was indeed formed upon the declaration:

"And I do swear, that I do reject and detest as unchristian and impious to believe that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under pretence of their being heretics: and also that unchristian and impious principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics. I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion that princes excommunicated by the Pope and Council, or by any authority of the See of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatever; and I do promise that I will not hold, maintain or abet, any such opinion, or any other opinion contrary to what is expressed in this declaration: and I do declare, that I do not believe the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, or superiority or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly with this realm."

All this is clear.—1. The declaration and the oath both distinctly reject and condemn as unchristian and impious that it is lawful to murder or destroy heretics for heresy, or under that pretence. 2. They both distinctly reject and condemn as unchristian and impious, that no faith is to be kept with heretics. 3. The oath declares that it is not a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, that princes excommunicated may be deposed or murdered—but it admits that such an opinion was held by some individuals. The juror declares he rejects and abjures the opinion.—Upon this head the declaration is more accurately worded than the oath, though their meaning is precisely the same. We shall in a future letter see that not keeping the precise form of the declaration on this point was the only cause of any difficulty, and of that difference in Ireland which gave room for the gross misrepresentation of which I proclaim. The oath generally rejects the opinion that they may be deposed, obviously, however, the meaning is, in consequence of being excommunicated—the declaration contained the precise word, and may therefore be deposed—clearly expressing the reason which the oath only implies.

But the most precious part is to come. And if ever I wished for any portion of the spirit of Cervantes, of Butler, or of Swift—it was

to be able to describe as I ought, the folly which endeavours to conceal its own injustice and errors by its laughable absurdity. The Catholics had been represented as not valuing the sanctity of an oath—the proof of the charges was that they permitted themselves to be plundered and enslaved by Protestants sooner than swear what they did not believe. They had been represented as believing that the Pope could dispense with their observing their oaths, yet they permitted themselves to be afflicted to the last degree of endurance rather than ask for that dispensation. They had been represented as believing that no oath to heretics is binding, yet they preferred permitting these heretics to take their valuable properties, and their valuable rights, and their valuable health, and their valuable feelings, and their valuable lives, rather than make those heretics, the empty compliment of a valueless oath! ! ! But now those Catholics were to be permitted to swear. Here was the jet of this melancholy joke.—To permit them to swear was to acknowledge that they had been calumniated, and plundered. Besides, the consciences of the Episcopal bench must be satisfied. Let the free and rational and powerful mind of America, read and stand amazed at the degrading burlesque of sanctimonious hypocrisy which assured the Catholic Committee that the act could not pass without the following addition, which it was of course necessary to have added to the oath for the purposes of satisfying the timorous consciences of their worst oppressors—and which to this day forms part of the recital of the disgusting farces which their courts occasionally exhibit. The Irish peer, the Irish archbishop, and the Irish peasant who scarcely knows, why he cannot be permitted to sign his own lease or give his note, until he shall have sworn to the truth of the contents of almost half a quire of paper, are all equally insulted by the following conclusion of their oath:

"And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, and of his only son Jesus Christ, my Redeemer, profess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration in the plain and ordinary sense of the words, without any equivocation or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, or of any person whatever, and without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning. So help me God."

Some persons thought this piece of insulting, contumelious falsehood, and blasphemous sporting with the name of God and the Redeemer, was added by a cunning device of men who wished to wound, but were afraid, or ashamed to strike, in order to disgust the Catholics with the

oath and render their refusal subservient to their own vile system of misrepresentation.

Be that as it may, I have never read the oath without mingled feelings of indignation and contempt, for the blending of its malignant imputations and ludicrous puerility.

Bad as its history is, I have been forced by you to give it, and shall still have to enter more deeply into the history of the subsequent transactions, for the purpose of vindicating that church to which I have the happiness and the honour of belonging, from the foul charges which you have, unfortunately for yourself and for my readers, been tempted to make. Why, in the name of common sense, did you not confine your extracts to some articles like the story which either you or Luther filched from Andrew Dunn? In cases like that there is more safety. You can always fight *in nubibus*, and when you are driven to such a pass as not to be able to poison Papists with arsenic, you can shower down barrels of flour upon them to crush their carcasses, and to give manna to their foes. But, good sirs, facts are very dangerous, if they are portions of history—you will neither be allowed to indulge your imagination, nor to exercise your inventive powers, you will always be brought to evidence. The more you test facts, the more will you please me, because I shall stick close to you until I shall enable our readers plainly to discover the truth. I have no interest in either deluding myself or deceiving others. Prove to me your assertions to be founded in truth. If you do, I pledge myself through the Editors of the *Miscellany*, who shall be publicly answerable as my bail, to renounce my profession of the Roman Catholic Faith. I know, good sirs, how much it would cost you to meet the offer by a similar one on your part. I am bound—you are free. But we must have a few letters more about the traitors, the Irish Papists, from

Yours, devotedly,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,

A native of Ireland.

LETTER V.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 31, 1824.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—In my last, I showed that your assertion respecting the contemplation of Parliament in 1768, to propose an oath of allegiance to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, was not true. I have given perhaps too

much in detail the history of the oath of 1774, which was the first oath. I now proceed to show that this first oath contained no such clause which you stated it did. The clause which you insert is in the following words:

"I do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that princes excommunicated by the Pope or by authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, and so forth."

The clause which was really introduced into the oath, and which still forms part of it, is in the following words:

"I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any authority of the See of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever."

So that it was not true to assert that a clause which never was in the oath was in it; neither have the two clauses the same meaning, as I shall show when I come to treat of the fact which caused your mistake. Your total ignorance of the history of the British and Irish Catholics is manifest: yet you thoughtlessly take upon you to write concerning facts of which you are grossly ignorant. If you know anything of the first principles of theology, you must at once perceive a serious and an important difference between the meaning of the clauses, and sirs, I hope you will not require that a Popish priest should be under the necessity of teaching you how proper it is that oaths should be in precise words. They are not Roman Catholics, sirs, who swear to the thirty-nine articles, and after having sworn, discuss what was the meaning of their oath. Roman Catholics like to know before they swear what is the exact meaning of the oath; they were not Papists, who swore the *et cetera* oath in 1640. Lest you might not have been able to find *The anatomy of and so forth, or the unfolding of the dangerous clause of the sixth Canon, London, printed* 1641, I will beg to inform you that it was a comment upon a clause of the said Canon, enacted in the Convention of 1640, which required every clergyman to swear, amongst other clauses, the following:

"Nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, and so forth."

Some persons who appear to have just as much respect for oaths as Papists have, objected to swear the *et cetera*, upon the ground that it might be brought to mean several things, which they never intended; amongst others, Cleveland, the satirist, has left us the following lines:

"I cannot half untruss
Et cetera, it is so abominous;
The Trogan nag was not so fully lined.

Unrip and so forth; and you shall find
Og, the great commissary, and which is worse
The apparator upon his skew-bald horse;
And finally my babe of grace forbear
Et cetera, 'twill be too far to swear,
For 'tis to speak in a familiar style
A Yorkshire 'Wea-bit,' longer than a mile.''

No such clause as you adduce was ever introduced into the Irish Catholic's oath of allegiance.

Now, good sirs, will you be pleased to inform me how that which was never introduced could be introduced for a special purpose? One would be really tempted to imagine when he read this pretty lucubration of yours, that you were, in writing, perfectly careless of even the semblance of truth. Indeed, sirs, your making the Irish Parliament introduce what they never introduced, to guard against a danger which never existed, is a sort of blunder to which moralists give a very short but a very significant name, and which, [as] not becoming the mouth of a gentleman to utter, I shall leave you to lisp out as prettily as you can; my pen is too genteel to afford ink for writing the shortest mode of expressing the assertion of the thing which is not. This, good sirs, is number two.

I have already shown what will warrant my stating that 1768, is number three. As to number 4, sirs, there never was a vicar apostolic, who had jurisdiction in Ireland, since the days of St. Patrick: for the Irish have in a most unprecedented manner preserved their hierarchy through fire and blood, since the days of its establishment to the present day; nor indeed, need they envy those who perhaps could boast for the commencement of theirs as celestial an emblem as that of Darius, King of Persia. I may then leave the noble war-horse to proclaim the new dynasty, by royal right and authority of Parliament, and the Irish will feel satisfied with the possession of that which came to them through humble fishermen. Before the days of St. Patrick there were in Ireland a few vicars apostolic; but Pope Celestine gave to him, not only Episcopal consecration, and regular jurisdiction, but also legatine authority; and he established an ordinary hierarchy, which, notwithstanding the worst efforts of the most cruel persecution, still continues, and which of course did exist in 1768.

Now, sirs, we come to see of what value is your argument respecting the letter of Dr. Ghillini. But before I proceed farther, I must ask who was Dr. Ghillini? The Pope's legate at Brussels. What is a legate? An ambassador. Is he infallible? No. Then what is the value of his assertions? The value of his commission. Does his commission extend

to explain the doctrines of the Church? Just as far as the American ambassador's at Paris extends to explain the Constitution of the United States. Would the American ambassador's decision supersede that of the Supreme Court? Would it outweigh that of the judges upon circuit?—Would it even equal that of the Attorney General? No; an ambassador of the Pope can bind his principal to do certain acts, which he has authority to agree to in his name: but he is not infallible, nor can he make the Pope infallible in any decision. If then the legate stated that these impious doctrines were doctrines of our church, his declaration would not have made them so. If he did any act, its force would not extend beyond the territory to which he was legate. He was legate to Flanders, not to Ireland. The question is then easily settled: Dr. Ghillini's opinion was not of more authority than Mr. Hawley's would have been, so far as right is concerned. He ought to know the Catholic doctrine, but he was not infallible. He might have erred.—Now I distinctly assert, that if Dr. Ghillini did teach what you state he did, he did err most egregiously.

You represent the legate as teaching—1. That it would be unlawful to swear an abhorrence of the doctrine, that faith was not to be kept with heretics; and of the doctrine that princes excommunicated by the Pope might be deposed or murdered. 2. That such an oath would be invalid, and could not bind or oblige conscience. 3. That these doctrines are defended by most Catholic nations. 4. That the Holy See has frequently followed them in practice. I shall show, first, that if Dr. Ghillini taught those four propositions, he taught what was not true, and I shall next show that he did not teach any one of them.

1. The doctrine of the Roman Catholic religion never changes. You acknowledge this yourselves. Now in 1757, whilst Benedict XIV., who was one of the [most learned] Popes of the last century, occupied the chair of St. Peter, the declaration of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity of Ireland containing the solemn abhorrence of those two doctrines, was recorded in Rome, and its propositions so far from being contradicted were approved of. Secondly, the Irish clergy and laity have since 1774, been in the constant habit of publicly swearing their declaration of abhorrence of those two doctrines, and yet they have been considered and esteemed most faithful Catholics, doing only what is lawful. Thirdly, the Roman Catholics of Great Britain, since the year 1791, have been openly in the habit of swearing to their abhorrence of those two doctrines, and yet have been considered and esteemed most faithful Roman Catholics, doing what was lawful. Fourthly, Pope Pius VI., has approved of this abjuration in each of those cases, and

has held communion with those who abjured those doctrines, he has made them his Vicars, and has given them every mark of affection and token of communion and love—his successors, Pius VII., and Leo XII. have followed the same line of conduct. Fifthly, the bishops of France, of Spain, of Portugal, of Italy, of Germany, of all the rest of Europe, not to mention the rest of the churches, held close communion with the bishops, who to their knowledge had made this abjuration. Sixthly, the principal Universities of the Roman Catholic Church in Europe, having been consulted by the directions of Mr. Pitt, by the Roman Catholics of England, upon the following queries, viz.:

"1. Has the Pope, or any Cardinal, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England?

"2. Can the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his majesty's subjects, from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?

"3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction either of a public or a private nature?"

The answers to this third query will be all I shall now refer to. They are as follows:

From the answer of the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris: "There is no tenet of the Catholic Church by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or those who differ from them in matters of religion. The tenet, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics, is so repugnant to common honesty, and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants, have complained more heavily, than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them, and so forth.

"Given at Paris in the general assembly of the Sorbonne, held on Thursday, the 11th day before the Calends of March, 1789."

From the answer of the Faculty of Divinity of Douay: "To the third question the sacred Faculty answers: That there is no principle of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, who differ from them in religious opinions. On the contrary, it is the unanimous doctrine of Catholics, that the respect due to the name of God, so called to witness, requires that the oath be inviolably kept, to whomsoever it is pledged, whether Catholic, heretic, infidel, and so forth. — February 5, 1789."

From the answer of the University of Louvain: "The Faculty of Divinity of Louvain having been requested to give its opinion upon the questions above stated, does it with readiness — but struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of this eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body, by inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernments of its natives!

"Proceeding to the third question, the said Faculty of Divinity (in perfect wonder that such a question should be proposed to it) most positively and unequivocally answers — that there is not, and there never has been among the Catholics,

or in the doctrine of the Church of Rome, any law or principle which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or others of a different persuasion from themselves in matters of religion, either in public or private concerns.

"The Faculty declares the doctrine of the Catholics to be, that the divine and natural law, which makes it a duty to keep faith and promises, is the same; and is neither shaken nor diminished, if those with whom the agreement is made, hold erroneous opinions in matters of religion, and so forth. — 18th of November, 1788."

From the answer of the University of Alcala: "To the third question it is answered: That the doctrine which would exempt Catholics from the obligation of keeping faith with heretics, or with any other persons who dissent from them in matters of religion, instead of being an article of Catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets. — March 17, 1789."

From the answer of the University of Salamanca: "To the third it is answered: That it is no article of Catholic faith, that Catholics may be allowed not to keep faith with heretics, or with from persons of any other description, who dissent them in matters of religion. — March 7, 1789."

From the answer of the University of Valladolid: "To the third, it is answered: that the obligation of keeping faith is founded on the law of nature, which binds all men equally without respect to their religious opinions; and with regard to Catholics, it is still more cogent, as it is confirmed by the principles of their religion. — February 17, 1789."

These decisions, good sirs, were procured at the desire of Mr. Pitt, by the Roman Catholics of England, because the British Parliament could not then without them be induced to relax any of its persecuting code. What a ridiculous figure must this arrogant and haughty nation have cut in the eye of learned Europe, when she, to the astonishment, not only of the faculty of Louvain, but of every man of common information, sent to know whether those blasphemous absurdities were tenets of the faith of the most numerous portion of the civilized world! ! How must Mr. Pitt's superciliousness have been rebuked upon reading the answer of the faculty of Louvain? I have often heard and read of the gullibility of John Bull; I have known much of it. But it required all the force of evidence to persuade me that even a yelping Cockney, or a Cornish miner, could be induced to believe such a libellous absurdity. I always loved America—I admired its rapid progress towards its high destines—I came expecting to find, at least as much liberality, and as much information upon the plain facts of religion, as was to be had in some English country towns, and on some Irish mountains. But what shall I say! O! I am mortified and humbled. When I find an entire junta of the ministers of the religion which pretends to most gentility, and most information, clergymen of the old established religion, or at least its substitute, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, at the very seat of government, in the Federal City, the publishers of a work said to be religious, and men who, if I am rightly

informed, have actually undertaken to teach some kind of theology; I am mortified and humbled when I find those men expose their ignorance so far as to repeat calumnies of which Europe has been ashamed during nearly half a century.

My conclusion here is, if Dr. Ghillini believed those were Catholic doctrines, he was egregiously in error.

1. If he taught that the oath by which they were abjured was therefore unlawful, he was in error. 2. If he taught that such oath was invalid and could not therefore bind conscience, he was in error. 3. If he taught that those doctrines were defended by most Catholic nations, he was in error.

They were condemned by the Catholic nation of France, by Catholic Flanders, whose University is astonished that a question should be raised upon the subject, and which declares that there never were such doctrines among Catholics. They were condemned by the Spanish Universities. I know the Portuguese would, if consulted, have gone at least as far as Spain. Will it be said that Germany was backward? Is there any doubt as to Poland? Centuries of the Italian history would wipe away any imputation from their nation upon this score. Where then are the Catholic nations? 4. If he asserted that the Holy See has frequently followed in practice the principle that no faith was to be kept with heretics—he was in error. Let one such instance be proved against that See. If he held that the Holy See frequently followed in practice the doctrine that excommunicated princes might be murdered by their subjects—he was greatly in error. Let a single case of the description be produced. If he taught that the Holy See followed frequently in practice the principle that princes ought to be deposed, because they were excommunicated, he asserted what is not a fact. I shall not now state more upon this head, for this brings me to a new topic. Ghillini did not teach any of those propositions. We shall see what was his difficulty, and what was the scruple of those Catholics who cared nothing for the sanctity of an oath.

Cardinal Bellarmine, and a few other writers, stated, not as Catholic doctrines, but as their opinion, that God gave to the Pope as much temporal power as was necessary for guarding the faith, because his principal duty of its preservation occasionally required the means for its protection by temporal aid: and therefore, that if one of the powerful children of the Church, became contumacious and mischievously exerted his influence to destroy the faith, the common father of the church could by God's authority, restrain him, and if he could not be

restrained without an abridgment of his temporal authority, the greater good of preserving the faith was sufficient warrant to abridge it.

This specious sophistry was rejected and treated as it deserved, by the great bulk of the Catholic princes, clergy, and people. It was never even suspected to have been in the contemplation of any human being, to propose this as a doctrine revealed by God; of course, not as a tenet of the Catholic Church; for nothing can be received as a tenet of the church, unless it has been revealed by God. But it was adduced as to the opinion of some writers, I care not how many or how few. Ghillini never asserted that the Pope had such power from God.

The Popes, in many instances, had a power of deposing kings and princes, not by divine right, but by the concession and grant of the nations and the kings themselves, deliberately given in congress. Surely, sirs, you will not assent that nations and their rulers cannot regulate certain cases, in which kings and princes of those nations can be lawfully deposed, and also appoint a judge of the case, and an executor of their will. The Holy See was made in several of these causes the judge, and in most instances the case of excommunication for public defection from the faith, was one of those causes. Thus, if a king or prince, whose nation or whose predecessor had been a party to his convention, did fall off from the faith, the Pope had two duties to perform: he had, as head of the church, by divine right, the duty of judging of the defection, and pronouncing the sentence of excommunication: and he had, as delegate of the council or congress that made the convention or temporal law for deposing such princes, upon the same evidence, then to pronounce the sentence of deposition, not by divine right, but by human right, by virtue of human law. Thus, speaking properly, those persons were not deposed by the Pope because of the excommunication, nor because of the defection from the faith, but because of the regulation of the congress which empowered him to execute the law which it had made; and there was scarcely a king in Europe who did not, at one time or another, become a party to that law, and thus give the power, by his own act. This law was not made by a council of bishops, but at their request by a congress of ambassadors, and confirmed by their sovereigns, and accepted by their nations, and acted upon by each nation against the others, but resisted by almost every nation, when it came to bear against itself. Thus, the Popes were, by the law of Europe, as fully warranted to depose the princes, who were parties to the law, as by the constitution of the United States the President is warranted to execute any law of Congress. I do not now examine the propriety or justice of the regulation: I only state the fact.

In the declaration of the Catholics in 1757, the words were, that they condemned the opinion that princes excommunicated, and so forth, "may therefore be deposed," and so forth. This was clear and explicit: and whilst it left no doubt as to the Catholics not believing that sentence of excommunication was sufficient reason for withdrawing their allegiance, it left the old law of Europe, which by human authority gave to the Pope a special power, just as it found it, to rest upon that authority. This also was the doctrine of the universities. But in drawing the oath, the word therefore was omitted; and to Ghillini and others this appeared to be in opposition to what was known to be lawful, viz., that such a convention could give the power of deposing excommunicated princes. The practice had been in existence in several Catholic countries, and the Holy See had acted upon the powers given to it. The oath appeared to condemn all this. Thus, they thought the oath was meant retrospectively to condemn all those acts which were legal at the time they were done. In this view the oath would in that part be unlawful; and, sirs, I need not, I trust, inform you that if one clause of an oath is bad, the whole oath is unlawful; and if an oath is unlawful, your own homilies and your own archbishop will tell you as the legate told the Irish. But the Irish bishops, especially Dr. Butler, Archbishop of Cashel, and the other monster prelates, proved to the satisfaction of Pope Pius VI., that Mr. Ghillini and those other gentlemen made a great mistake as to the meaning given to the phrases by the Irish Parliament, which, of course, as being the legislature, was the tribunal best qualified to explain what it intended to have sworn. The mistake with regard to the Pope's power of dispensing with oaths, was also understood imperfectly by the legate. But, sirs, those questions have been settled to the satisfaction of the British government, and the Pope and those traitors, the Irish Papists, now during nearly fifty years; and you might have known more about them, had you been at all industrious. Sirs, it would be more creditable to you to study before you write, than to retail in America the libels upon us which have been, during a quarter of a century, scouted from Europe, and which no man who had the least regard for his reputation would, in Europe, repeat. As I am not, sirs, informed that what is known in Europe to be untrue, becomes truth when brought to America, I shall believe those statements to be here of the same nature as they would be there, until I shall have been better instructed.

As to the last statement purporting to be taken from the Surgeon, viz.:

"Before this oath could receive the sanction of the legislature, it was condemned

by the vicars apostolical of the western, northern, and southern districts, in an encyclical letter, addressed 'to all the faithful clergy and laity of those districts.' ''

This, sirs, does not regard Ireland. The Irish act was passed in 1774, the explanation to which, the variance between the terms of the declaration in 1757, and the oath in 1774, gave rise, had been completed to the satisfaction of all parties in 1776. But in 1786, after a lapse of ten years, the English Catholic committee was formed, and the present Mr. Charles Butler, under the appellation of secretary, became its dictator. With perhaps the best intentions, but with extraordinary presumption, he undertook to confer with a number of Protestant statesmen, who were disposed to be liberal, as to the best mode of so framing the discipline of the Catholic Church in England, as to meet the prejudices of the people; and as they had been taught to hate the name "Roman Catholics," they were to lay this aside, and the poor Papists were to take up the harmonious nickname of "Protesting Catholic Dissenters." How a Pole, or a Russian, or an Italian, or a Chinese, or a Tartar, or even a poor Irish Papist, was to recognise his brother with a new nickname, and some of Mr. Butler's quibbles to prove by chancery distinctions how lawfully he might swear that he was a Protestant, because he protested against the calumnies charged upon him, and that he was a Dissenter, because he dissented from the Church of England, would puzzle you and me to know. I doubt that even the sign of the cross and the *Latin Liturgy*, and the holy water, could have reconciled them, though unquestionably the new feathers stuck in could not have concealed all his plumage, for he still kept the Catholic. However, these sounds are rather novel, "Protestant Catholic," "Dissenter Catholic." To be sure, they jar a little now upon the ear, *sed plura te usus docebit.* Now, sirs, neither you nor Mr. Charles Butler can complain of me; I will vouch you could swear that in his way, I am as good a Protestant as any in America, and I could myself swear I am a staunch Dissenter.

The Catholics thought this was going a little too far; but Mr. Mitford, now Lord Redesdale, thought otherwise. And that he was very fit to regulate their concerns, he proved by his bigoted folly, when he was Lord Chancellor in Ireland. However, he grew more civil after the venerable Bishop Coppinger, of Cloyne and Ross, referred his Lordship to some Irish statutes, which proved to him that his virulence had even outrun the cruelty of Irish legislation, and proved to him that an Irish parish priest was not a traitor, though a good English Protestant had flogged him most unmercifully, and had sent him to New Holland with wretched convicts. And Lord Redesdale thought it very ungenerous that his bishop should prove that this priest did not deserve this

punishment, so that even the British government were, by the force of the evidence, obliged to bring him back. Lord Redesdale was as little pleased with this as you are with me—and for the very same reason, that operates upon you. Yet this was one of the principal men selected to regulate the discipline of the English Catholics. In England the Catholics lost their hierarchy—they had vicars apostolic. Those vicars preferred regulating their own concerns. They found the oath which was proposed contained several objectionable clauses; amongst others, one which, by direct implication, would assert that there existed a heresy such as never existed. They condemned the oaths for those faults, not for its abjuration of the imputed doctrines. They, through Bishop Milner, petitioned for the Irish oath, which abjured the doctrines; they obtained it, they swore it; to this day they swear it: therefore it is not true that they rejected and condemned an oath because it condemned those imputed tenets, but they rejected an oath which did condemn them, because it was on other accounts objectionable.

Now, sirs, having gone through the dissection of your Surgeon, I shall in my next begin my demonstration upon yourselves.

Wishing you many happy returns, I am devotedly yours,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,
A native of Ireland.

LETTER VI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 7, 1825.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—Having exhibited at much greater length than I intended, the total want of truth in your premises, so far as they regarded the treaty of Westphalia, the Roman Catholics of Ireland, the Vicars Apostolic of England, and Legate Ghillini, at Brussels, you can now call me off to Rome, and you begin upon your own account:

"These doctrines, in relation to excommunicated princes and faiths with heretics, are allowed to have been contained in the 4th Lateran, and other general councils, uniformly considered infallible."

Now, sirs, you must permit me to translate the above passage into English. I have studied your language, and am therefore, I trust, competent to the task:

Translation: "These doctrines in relation to excommunicated princes and faith with heretics, are allowed to have been taught by the 4th Latern," and so forth.

Or thus: "Are allowed to have been contained in the canons of the 4th Latern," and so forth.

Sirs, the doctrine as put by your Surgeon, that princes excommunicated by the Pope, might be murdered by their subjects, was never taught by any council, certainly not by the 4th council of Lateran; the doctrine that princes excommunicated by any ecclesiastical authority, might be murdered by their subjects, was never taught by any council: the doctrine that princes might, under any circumstances, be murdered by their subjects, or by any person or persons was never taught, was never abetted, by any council. Murder has been prohibited by the law of God. No council ever assumed to change the law of God. No council ever assumed to justify what God has condemned. Neither is there any such provision, nor any semblance of it in any of the acts of any council. The murder portion is not warranted by any single expression that I know of in any Roman Catholic council.

However it may not be amiss to produce what this 4th council of Lateran enacted, respecting shedding of blood. As you, sirs, are canonists, you must have read its enactments; I believe you will allow the following to be a fair transcript of:

"Canon XVIII. *Sententiam sanguinis nullus clericus dictet aut proferat: sed nec sanguinis vindictam exerceat, aut ubi exercetur intersit . . . nec quisquam clericus literas scribat, aut dictet pro vindicta sanguinis destinandas. Unde in curiis principum hoec sollicitudo non clericis, sed laicis committatur.*"

"Let no clergyman dictate or pronounce a sentence of blood: neither let him carry the vindicative sentence of blood into execution, nor be at its execution . . . . nor let any clergyman write or dictate letters destined to warrant the execution of a vindictive sentence of blood. Wherefore, let this charge be committed, not to clergymen, but to laymen in the courts of princes."

This is doubtless a very extraordinary canon for a council which we are told taught that subjects might murder their princes, provided those princes had been excommunicated by the Pope. There were present in this council, ambassadors of the Emperors Otho IV. of the West, and Henry of the East, together with those of most of the kings and princes of Europe; and yet we are gravely told that without a single remark on their part, the council did teach that their masters might be murdered, provided the Pope had previously excommunicated them!!! Now let us see what you would have us believe:

1. That this council strained at a gnat in prohibiting clergymen, in its 18th canon, the practice of such parts of surgery as required amputations, incisions, and cautery; besides the passing, or executing, or aiding in executing sentence, which caused the shedding of blood; and yet swallowed a camel, by sanctioning murder, and yet that they gave this sanction so cunningly, that although it was given, it was so

perfectly concealed as to baffle any person's scrutiny who sought to discover it. Probably it was written with lemon juice.

2. That this council proclaimed this doctrine in the presence of the congress of all emperors, kings and princes of Christendom, and that they, good souls! were so pious and so priest-ridden as not to object one syllable lest the Pope should excommunicate them and they should be murdered.

3. You require of us to believe that several general councils taught the doctrine that princes excommunicated by the Pope might be murdered, and this weighty charge is fastened on those councils, and not only upon them, but upon all the Roman Catholics, except those who are too ignorant to be wicked, without your adducing one syllable from any act of any council; without adducing any cotemporary writer; without any cotemporary historian; without adducing any monument; in a word, without one particle of evidence; but you repeat an old calumny of which the basest hack of the most degraded press in Europe, would now feel ashamed. And you deliberately insult the understanding of America by requiring it to take your assertion of falsehood for evidence of a fact.

4. You require us to believe this murderous doctrine, though you do not adduce the name of one prince, who being excommunicated, has been so murdered. Not to mention several upon the continent of Europe, the mean and unprincipled John of England, who would betray the rights of his people and of his throne, to the ambition of Rome, found no one to murder him, but he found Roman Catholic Bishops and Roman Catholic Barons, to compel him to preserve at least some liberty, to sign their Magna Charta, and to treat Rome as she deserved, when she interfered with the rights and liberties of the people of England.[66] The creator of your parent church, King Henry VIII., whom you praise God for having raised up as a godly and pious prince, was excommunicated by the Pope, and yet no Roman Catholic dipped his hand in his blood. Your Elizabeth, of whose virginity you boast, as one of our states yet testifies, though you decry the observance in us which you commend in her, was excommunicated by the Pope—yet though her unfortunate Papist cousin was murdered, no Roman Catholic cut short the days of her single blessedness; nor refused to venture his life against her enemies.

Thus without evidence against probability in the face of

[66] See in regard to this, and some similarly incautious expressions, a note to Art. on *Papal Dispensation*, on K. John, in Part III.

facts, you make an assertion which we pronounce to be a calumny. What better proof of a negative can we adduce?

The doctrine of the Surgeon in relation to faith with heretics, viz., that no faith was to be kept with them, was never taught by this nor by any other Roman Catholic council that I know of. I therefore take the liberty of despatching very summarily your assertion in relation thereto. You have made the assertion, I deny its truth, and defy you to prove it.

We come, sirs, to a proposition which contains all the fallacy of the assertion which you have made, and which therefore requires a more close examination. You assert that it is well known that the doctrine that princes excommunicated by the Pope should therefore be deposed by their subjects, was maintained in the 4th council of Lateran, and other general councils. Laying aside your vague phrase, other general councils, we shall confine ourselves to the one which you specify. You add, this council was uniformly considered infallible. This again is too loose a mode of writing where the charge is of so grave a nature. We had better, first be precise here.

I beg to remind you that you being a learned theologian, must be aware that Roman Catholics do not believe general councils to be infallible in all their transactions. Suppose then a general council did teach that princes excommunicated by the Pope ought to be deposed, would this be a subject upon which Roman Catholics are bound to believe the judgment of the council would be infallibly correct? By no means. Roman Catholics believe the general council properly constituted and conducted will with infallible certainty give a correct decision, 1st, upon any question as to what doctrines God has revealed: that is, respecting articles of faith. 2d, Respecting doctrinal facts, such as whether a special book contains true doctrines, or has errors, and if so, what these errors are. 3d, Respecting the truth or falsehood, the correctness or error of principles of morality. Beyond this extent, no Roman Catholic is bound to believe any council infallible.

He is not bound to believe the council infallible in making civil or political regulations. Neither is he required to believe that the council has any power or authority to make any such regulation, and if the council should make it, he is not therefore bound to obey it. Suppose a general council were to make a law requiring under pain of excommunication, the Roman Catholic citizens of the United States to vote for no candidate for office unless he was a Roman Catholic, the Papists of this Union would disobey the law, their bishops and priests would conitnue to officiate and would be still in the communion of the church, be-

cause the sentence of excommunication would be invalid, for the law would have been made respecting a subject not within the jurisdiction of the council; it would have just as much value as an act of Congress regulating how cardinals should be chosen and in what manner the Archbishop of Toledo should make his visitation. If councils sometimes undertook what they ought not to undertake, they did no more than other bodies which have exceeded their powers but not forfeited them. Suppose Congress should during its present session, pass an act to regulate the manner in which Leo XII. should give his blessing during the jubilee, now observed in Rome, would General LaFayette's grant, be thereby invalidated? Yet this is the species of logic, with which we are every day assailed. "Your councils did some things which were not within their jurisdiction, therefore they never had jurisdiction to do anything."

You would ask next, suppose an army of the Popish nations was raised to punish those excommunicated American Papists, what would be done? Never fear; we have General Jackson, and I assure you, if he would take command, he need not ask a single Protestant to fight. We would give him Catholics enough who would never halt upon the boundary line to convert the Constitution into a shield for their bodies, instead of making their bodies a shield for the Constitution. Of course, you would cry out against the bigotry of this council for preventing Papists from voting to place Protestants in offices. What say you to North Carolina and to New Jersey, that prevent Protestants from giving their votes to Catholics? This is toleration. This is liberty of conscience. Suppose the Papists embodied themselves to place Catholics, by force, in those offices, and that those two tolerant sisters in our Union became disturbed in consequence of this exception to Papists in their constitutions, and they called upon the President—would not the whole military force of the Union be brought to bear upon the rebellious Papists in those states? And if they persisted, would they not be exterminated? Thus, sirs, in our own land of civil and religious liberty, we have two states whose sapient conventions weighing well and duly estimating the dangers to which their liberties would be exposed by reason of the terrors of their childish imaginations, and the calumnies of our enemies, have as yet continued an odious distinction, which is less disgrace to those who suffer under it, than to those who continue it, and to support which, if necessary, all the force of the Union, Catholic and Protestant, should contribute, even to the shedding of blood, until it shall be constitutionally abolished.

Now, sirs, the canon of the Council of Lateran to which you evi-

dently allude, and which, if I can judge from your context you appear rather to have learned of from others, than to have read yourselves, is one which, if passed by bishops, was beyond their power, for it regarded temporal punishment: which, if passed by the Congress of ambassadors, was by the law of nations good and valid: which, from the circumstances of the times seems to have been very necessary, and is more defensible upon just reasoning and upon the principles of our constitution, than the clauses which disqualify Catholics for offices in North Carolina and New Jersey. And which has not by any means the force or extent which you insinuate.

I might very easily deny at once your assertion, but I prefer giving a more detailed though perhaps a tedious explanation of the true meaning of this misrepresented canon of the Council of Lateran. This council was held in 1215, under Pope Innocent III. The first canon condemns a special heresy by its special recitations of doctrine. These were principally the unity of God who is creator both of spirit and of matter, in opposition to the Manichean principle of two Gods, one the creator of spirit, and the other the creator of matter. Also that he created the good angels and the bad angels, all being created originally good, but some by the abuse of their free will, having become wicked; in opposition to the same sect who taught that they were the creations of different Gods: also, that he was the author of the old law, given by Moses and the prophets, and of that given by Jesus Christ; moreover that the Son of God assumed true flesh from his Virgin Mother: that sect taught that the Son of God could not have true flesh, as all flesh was created by an evil principle, and that the Old Testament was given by the bad God, and the New Testament by the author of good. I shall not go farther into the details, for here is all which now suits my purpose, and though the remainder would strengthen my argument it would only be a confirmation, which just now it does not need. One of the consequences of this Manichean principle was, that as it was criminal to oppose the author of good and to aid the author of evil, no person could without sin co-operate in the production of bodies; marriage was forbidden, but shameful and nameless criminality abounded, especially amongst the Bulgari, the Vaudois, and the Albigenses. This profligate heresy was known in the council by distinct and pre-eminent characteristic, *hæc hæresis*, "this heresy." The council, it is true, condemned also the Abbot Joachim's errors of Quaternity, in its second canon; but his was not this heresy, and this heresy was not every heresy. In any civilized nation the crime of this heresy is punishable with death, and if Bishop Joycelyn had been found guilty of it in London, where

he did not wait for his trial, he would have been hanged. Of course you will not require of me to inform you who Bishop Joycelyn is, nor will I so far degrade myself as to imitate a certain class of writers, who if in the course of a century they can find out a criminal Pope or a criminal Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, will exhibit him to the world as a fair sample of what the church is, and when told that in the same church there are good and virtuous men, will answer, "True—but they are better than their religion." No, sirs, the Council of Lateran did not more deeply execrate and condemn the crime, than does that church to which Bishop Joycelyn belongs, and his crime, and those of several English black-coats recorded on their public papers in England, within the last two or three years, are not to be imputed to the body which condemns and execrates their crimes. They would be condemned by its clergy, and they are doomed to death by the laws of England. Were the bishops of the Council of Lateran criminal in condemning this heresy? Were the members of the Congress of ambassadors criminal in declaring it a crime, such as ought not to be tolerated, and enacting that if the feudatory lords did not punish the criminals, they should be deposed? Some process was necessary for the purpose of having the law executed. This was regulated in the III. Canon of that council, by the joint authority of the council and the congress. Let us see this obnoxious portion of the canon:

Damnati vero haeretici soecularibus Protestatibus proesentibus, aut eorum Ballivis relinquantur animadversione debita puniendi. Clericis prius a suis ordinibus degradatis ita quod bona hujusmodi damnatorum, si laici sint confiscentur: si vero clerici, applicentur ecclesiis, a quibus stipendia perceperunt.

You must clearly perceive in this portion of the canon full evidence of the act's being of a temporal nature, and all such were passed by the temporal powers present; but as there was also, upon two grounds, a claim respecting the concerns of the church, the bishops were to pass this portion. Very clearly too, this did not regard a decision of faith, as the two previous canons did; it was a mere civil regulation, but having in two respects a bearing upon religious concerns: the council had no claim either to infallibility, or exclusive jurisdiction, upon the subject.

"But condemned heretics, are to be left to be punished according to their deserts, by the secular powers that are present, or by their bailiffs."

Because of another canon which forbid, as I showed, a clergyman to interfere, or even to draw the warrant, the clergy were merely to find as jurors the special fact, upon the question, whether the individual arraigned did hold such heretical tenets as were charged. The secular power alone had the right to say whether it would therefore look upon him to be a criminal—and also to say whether it would punish him, and

to say what punishment should be, and to inflict it. With all this the council had no concern; God gave the church no authority in those matters. But it certainly was a question for an ecclesiastical tribunal to decide upon whether this man held that heretical doctrine. The next was also a matter for bishops to regulate: the confiscation of property was a state question, but had been regulated by the feudal customs and law.

"Clergymen are to be first degraded from their orders; the goods, also, of the condemned, if they be laymen, are to be confiscated — if they be clergymen, are to be given to the churches from which they receive stipends."

The next object was to provide for the execution of this law. To judge fairly of any question we must try it by its own circumstances, not by extraneous or inapplicable circumstances. This law for punishing criminals was not lately made in America, where there is a special mode of impeachment, but in feudal times. We must judge by feudal customs. The feudatory held from his sovereign upon certain conditions; so long as he observed the conditions, his title was good; so long as the title was good, his vassals were bound to allegiance to him; as soon as he violated the conditions, the allegiance to him was at an end. The only persons who could affix those conditions to the tenure were the sovereigns; and when the feudatory was in possession under his title, no new condition could be added without his consent and acceptance. The special mode adopted for insuring the execution of this law is contained in the subsequent part of this canon, and it regulates the whole process of the punishment; deposition after impeachment of the negligent feudatory to whom the execution of the law was committed. The Pope was made the judge, and he had no discretion, for the canon regulated the process; and after the process, he should pronounce the sentence.

Si vero Dominus temporalis requisitus et monitus ab Ecclesia, terram suam purgare neglexerit ab hac hoeretica Foeditate, per Metropolitanum et coeteros comprovinciales Episcopos excommunicationis vinculo innodetur. Et si satisfacere neglexerit intra annum, significatur hoc summo Pontifici, ut ex tunc ipse vassallos ejus fidelitate denunciet absolutos: et terram exponat Catholicis occupandam, qui eam, exterminatis hoereticis, sine ulla contradictione possideant, et in fidei puritate conservent: salvo jure Domini principalis, dummondo super hoc ipse nullum proestet' obstaculum, nec aliquod apponat impedimentum: eadem nihilominus lege servata circa eos qui non habent dominos principales.

"But if the temporal Lord, being required and admonished by the church, shall have neglected to cleanse his land from this heretical filth, let him be excommunicated by the Metropolitan and the other Bishops of the province; and if he shall have neglected to make satisfaction within a year, let this be made known to the Pope, that he may declare absolved thenceforward from their allegiance, his vassals, and may give up the land to be occupied by Catholics who have dispossessed the heretics, may keep it without any contradiction in the purity of faith; saving the

right of the principal Lord, provided he shall place no obstacle nor give any impediment to this: the same process is also to be observed respecting those who have no principal Lords.''

This is not, sirs, a decision of doctrine made by divine authority by an infallible tribunal, and which is therefore justly to be called a tenet of the church; and for which, and for the inevitable consequences of which, every individual member of that church is responsible,—but it is a law by authority of the secular powers which were present, binding those whom they could bind, and no others, to its observance; and providing for its execution by the principles of what was for them, then, but not now for us, the law of nations: and thus, although it gave to the Pope a power of declaring, after due process, what lord had forfeited his claim to allegiance, because of neglect of his duty in a special case, it did not give to him a general power of deposing in any one case—his power was rather declaratory, than executive. The execution was committed to the secular powers which continued faithful. And the person who should execute the law would not hold his tenure from the Pope, but from the sovereign,—not by virtue of the Papal authority, but in consequence of this special law. It is, therefore, as gross a misrepresentation to state, that it is a part of the Catholic religion to believe that the Pope has the power of deposing princes who are excommunicated,—as it would be to say it was part and portion of the Protestant religion, that a child who became a Protestant should be entitled to strip all his Popish brothers and sisters, and his poor old Popish parents of their lands and tenements, because a Protestant Parliament once made the law, and the head of the Protestant Church has in hundreds of instances enforced it.

How would all the presses in the Union groan against my bigotry, and my ignorance, and my calumnious falsehood, were I to publish that it is part of your religion enacted by the same kind of general council that formed the Church of England, and frequently enforced by its supreme head, whether male or female, that the plunder of a whole conscientious family by a profligate, disobedient and hypocritical child, is lawful in the sight of God, and meritorious in the plunderer! Yet it is equally true as your assertion,—in fact, more near to truth, as I know well. Mark, then, the difference, even in the United States, between you and me. You libel me, and not a press complains, but the single one employed by the *Miscellany*. No one, except your humble servants, tells you that you do wrong. But let us change sides; let me treat you as you treat me, and I verily believe I dare not show my face abroad; and even in the recesses of my concealment I would be pelted with paragraphs. O! What an exhibition of Popery and bigotry would be made?

However, sirs, America daily adds to her stock of knowledge, and fables cannot, at this side of the Atlantic, much longer pass for history.

So that I may now conclude: no council which claimed infallibility taught either of those doctrines which you and your Surgeon imputed to us. I say no council, for no other but that of Lateran has been adduced,—and I suppose, if you had others, they would have been named.

My letters are tedious sirs, but I cannot help having them so, for you have forced me into dry and wearisome examinations; and I still feel it necessary to continue, as well, sirs, for your instruction, as for the vindication of myself. Yours very devotedly,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,
A native of Ireland.

LETTER VII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 14, 1825.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—You, I trust, must now feel satisfied, that you have failed to prove Roman Catholics guilty of holding the abominable and destructive tenet that "No faith is to be kept with heretics." You must perceive that the Pope did not teach that doctrine at the time of the protest against the treaty of Westphalia; and you must feel equally certain that you grossly traduced my unfortunate countrymen, whom the objects of your esteem and admiration oppressed, and plundered, and persecuted. I am convinced, if you do not perceive all this, such of the American people as have had the kindness and the patience to read my letters, have no doubt upon the subject.

Now, sirs, allow me to put a case which, of course, is not very improbable. Suppose one of you had the honour of being invited to preach before the Senate of the United States; and this enlightened body was engaged in deliberation as to whether it would advise the President to make a treaty with the King of France, with the Emperor of Austria, with the King of Spain, with the King of Portugal, or any of those other Papists who are in power in Europe; or with the Republic of Colombia, or that of Mexico, or any of those Popish governments at this side of the Atlantic. In common prudence, the Senate ought not to consider any man to be better than his profession; or, if this enlightened body considered any man inconsistent with his profession, what reliance could it have upon his profession to observe his treaty? Thus, if one of you believed what you have written, you must feel it your duty to speak

truth to the Senate, especially if you were paid for telling what you conscientiously believed to be God's truth. It would then be your duty, a duty for which the nation pays you, to tell that Senate, "It is a religious tenet of this Popish nation not to keep faith with you heretics, for 'this is a Protestant country.' You have sworn to maintain the rights of the nation, and yet you sacrifice those rights to persons with whom you cannot safely treat; for they may promise as much as they please, but the Pope can ruin your diplomacy—no faith will be kept with you." Suppose you were able to prevail upon the present chaplain to the Senate, who is a clergyman of your church, to use such language as this; I should suppose the Senate would believe him, because, I could not otherwise see how that body would be justified in paying him. They pay him out of the property of the nation for preaching truth, and beseeching God to give them wisdom. If this gentleman believed what you wrote to be truth, it is his positive duty to preach it to the Senate; it is his positive duty to pray to God to make the Senate wise, to sanction no treaty with men who are inconsistent with their profession,—nor with men whose profession it is not to keep faith with this country. The Senate looks upon his doctrine to be true, advises the President accordingly,—if they believe their preacher this is their bounden duty; if they do not believe him, why pay him?—the President bids Mr. Adams inform the ambassadors that the treaty cannot be entered into. Negotiators generally like to know why they cannot succeed, because it is a very natural question for their principals to ask them why they fail. Now, only imagine such a man as Mr. Adams telling the French ambassador,—why, no doubt, people say that Mr. Adams himself said some things which we like to forget, and got some things printed which we hope he did not,—but only imagine Mr. Adams cogitating the various modes of diplomatic expression which would convey these ideas,—"Sir, the king, your master, and you and every member of the same church, who is not too ignorant to know what his religion is, has so little principle, that we do not know how he can be bound to observe a treaty; therefore we will make no treaty with him, nor with any member of his church; and this is the reason why your mission has failed. Our Senate have selected a wise theologian to instruct them; and he has assured the nation that you keep no faith with heretics like us, for, sir, this is a Protestant country." The ambassador writes home to Europe. What a figure, think you, sirs, would our nation make? What wonder and awe would reign through all the Popish Universities at contemplating the deep erudition of the chaplain of the Senate! How would Kings and Emperors envy the felicity of the august body which had so much

piety and learning at the trifling expense of only eight dollars daily! We are not certain of the amount, but this is only a trifle. How would the Prince of Croi, the Archbishop of Paris, Don Victor Saez, and the old Trappist, bite their lips! The cardinals would tremble, the Tiber run back with affright, and our own capitol would no longer envy its ancient prototype the cackling sentinel, as we too should be providentially saved from Gaulish ruin.

I should hope the reverend chaplain of the Senate does not believe that it is a tenet of Roman Catholics, "that faith is not to be kept with heretics." No, I should be sorry to think the Senate of the United States would so far testify against nearly, if not fully, two hundred thousand of their fellow-citizens, as to select for their chaplain a man who would publish to the world that these Papists were unworthy of being trusted by their government until they changed their religion. Would such men as Mr. Gaillard and Mr. Hayne insult their Catholic fellow-citizens in this State by indulging such a suspicion? How many of them are to be found in Mr. Hayne's own regiment in this city? Yet you would tell this respectable senator not to confide in the Popish captain, the Popish lieutenants, the Popish sergeants, the Popish soldiers of his regiment!! Do the Popish members of Congress know their religion? Do they keep faith with heretics? Do the Popish officers of the army keep faith with this country? Has the Secretary at War betrayed his trust when he selected a Popish clergyman to make some of the most important examinations in the scientific department of our most useful national academy? Are not all our archives in the Department of State, in the custody of Papists? Were not some of our oldest commanders in the navy—are not some of our present most active officers of that branch of the service—are not a large portion of our sailors Papists? Is not the greater number of our army made up of these traitors, the Irish Papists? Are not many of our foreign consuls Papists? What then could have possessed you, with all those facts before your eyes—in the midst of so many Popish ambassadors and ministers of Popish kings and powers, so to outrage common decency, to expose yourselves, and as far as in you lay, to degrade our nation by declaring such a monstrous falsehood as that it was a tenet of our church, that no faith was to be kept with you; that no oath could bind us to you, and that we could not be good citizens unless we change our religion? I protest solemnly, though I have written so much upon the subject, and been so familiar with your mistakes—I can yet scarcely believe that I am awake, and in America, and find such an assertion seriously put forward by a man claiming to be a clergyman, and of a church too, very like one, and almost a branch

of one which has produced eminent and respectable scholars, men of great general knowledge and of extensive learning.

Do I go too far, sirs, when I turn your artillery upon yourselves?

"Nor misdeem a soldier's bold emprise,
Who, in the dissonance of barb'rous war
Long-trained, revisits oft the sacred treasures
Of antique memory!"

Suppose, sirs, that the Roman Catholic Church were the guilty thing which you exhibited:

"Thieves for their robbery have authority,
When judges steal themselves, —
Go to your bosom;
Knock there, and ask your heart, what it doth know,
That's like my brother's fault: if it confess
A natural guiltiness, such as is his,
Let it not sound a thought upon your tongue
Against my brother's life.
. . . . . .
The jury, passing on the prisoner's life,
May in the sworn twelve have a thief or two
Guiltier than him they try."

Sirs, as I have got into conversation with old Will Shakespeare, I cannot for the life of me, without regret, quit my poor friend for such dry and tedious fellows, as I must soon keep company with, by your compulsion. You have come out boldly, and in all your strength.

"O, it is excellent,
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant.
Could great men thunder
As Jove himself does, Jove's would ne'er be quiet.
For every pelting, petty officer,
Would use his heaven for thunder; nothing but thunder,
Merciful Heaven!"

Dear! dear! I must get into other company. Well, sirs, you have, of course, read of such a personage as Thomas Cranmer,—Papists believe that an oath must be taken in the sense of the parties imposing it. Such, too, sirs, is the doctrine of all the public writers; of all the moralists of the Church of England. This said Thomas obtained bulls for the Archbishopric of Canterbury in 1532 from Pope Clement VII., and was consecrated in 1533, by a Popish Bishop; he being at the time privately married in Germany, contrary to the canons, which he then swore to observe, and which were then and during the reign of Henry VIII. a part of the law of England. If the canons were against his conscience, why swear to observe and enforce them? If they were not, why swear to observe them whilst he was conscious of their violation? He also swore

the canonical oath of obedience to the Pope—at the very time that he had determined to throw off his authority. I am aware that it is pretended that he, with the King's approbation, previously took four witnesses privately into St. Stephen's Chapel, and then in their presence signed a protestation against taking the oath, except with the reservation—of its accordance with the law of God, the King's rights, and his own notions of reformation. I do not believe he made any such previous protestation, because I find the best critics, and the persons who were cotemporary and intelligent and conscientious writers, deny it. But suppose he made this private protestation, without the Pope's knowledge, and without the knowledge of the consecrating Bishops. We find him go publicly to the altar, and take the oath without a single remark before the public. What would you say to Papists if they justified such duplicity and dishonesty? Will oaths be any security, if it be lawful to make previous private protests, and publicly to swear boldly through the whole? But this was not all: the good Archbishop had to swear the same oath again before he was invested with the Pallium, and he swore it, publicly and openly, and unqualifiedly; and it is the admirers of this man of Apostolic simplicity who charge with a disregard for their oaths, the men who suffer every species of plunder and contumely, rather than take an oath which they cannot look upon as a testimony [to] truth!! It is the admirers of this man who charge us with having Papal dispensations to swear as we please!!

This same good Bishop who swore to observe the canons, yielded precedence in the convocation to Thomas Cromwell, a layman, as Vicar-General of his Majesty, King Henry VIII., to whom, as supreme head in earth of God's church, he now swore the oath of supremacy; and because the king desired him, he, in contravention of that oath, yielded his own powers, and procured the other Bishops to do the same, and to petition the king for commissions during his good pleasure. To how many contradictions and inconsistencies did he get his signature? And swear to one side and the other? This, sirs, is your first Archbishop. Have Roman Catholics ever reasoned so badly, or been so grossly unjust as to infer from this man's exhibitions, that it is a tenet of the English Protestant Church, that oaths are not binding? Have they ever been guilty of the foul calumny of charging your church with holding as tenets, the corrupt maxims of its criminal members, or the follies of its weak members, and unblushingly asserted that men who fall far short in their practice of the morality which it teaches, were better in their conduct than the principles of their religion; and that their virtue was the result of their ignorance of their own tenets?

I do not mean, sirs, to give you more than a slight hint for the purpose of refreshing your memories, but if you are disposed to enter fully into the details, I will pledge myself to give you facts, until you cry out "hold, hold—enough, enough." Suppose the Pope did cause those princes to be deposed who would not obey the general law of Christendom in favour of morality. Is the Roman Catholic Church the only one which deposes magistrates for their peculiarity of doctrine? Allow me here to do justice to the Vaudois. In my last, I in the hurry of my pen wrote their name where I ought not: the early Vaudois, that is in the twelfth century, ought not to be classed with the folks of Bulgaria, or of Toulouse, or Albi. Let us hear a few of the Reformers on this subject. Your friend Wickliffe would depose a magistrate for having committed any mortal sin, one much less than heresy would answer: for instance, such a trifle as bearing false witness against a body of from one to two hundred millions of persons during about eighteen hundred years. I have no doubt but he would say, a man neither ought to be a king nor even have power to preach in a Senate chamber, who would have committed this peccadillo. What would he then have said to heresy, and especially to this Heresy? Luther often attacked that arch heretic, the Pope. But in his *Theses*, published in 1545, he informs his friends that the Pope is a mad wolf, "against which the world takes up arms at the first signal, without waiting for any command from a magistrate, and if after he has been shut up in an inclosure, the magistrate sets him at liberty, you may continue to pursue the savage beast, and with impunity attack those that prevent his destruction. If you fall in the engagement before the beast has received a mortal wound, you have only one thing to repent of, that you did not bury your dagger in his breast."

This is the way to deal with the Pope; all those who defend him must be treated also like a band of robbers under their captain, whether they be kings or Cæsars." This is pretty clear.

But England—Yes, that land of light and liberty. She would not depose a king, if he became a Catholic! Is there no law in England to depose a king for being of an unparliamentary religion? Say you so? Indeed, indeed, I am not very fond of the memory of James II. I would not pay his relics as much respect as King George IV. had paid them. I believe, however, that the true reason for his deposition was his Popery. Kings more arbitrary held the sceptre without having been deposed. Was he as arbitrary as his father, the martyr of your calendar? I beg your pardon; not your's, but [that] of the Church of England. Was he as arbitrary as his first name sake? I may be allowed the privilege of my country, if I make a king of the good Queen Bess. Pray, did

the pusillanimous monarch, who helped to ruin that country, kick and cuff as despotically as did your virgin mistress? I am in error, for I address you as if you were a clergyman of the English Protestant Church. What think you of King Henry VIII., "the faithful and true minister of most famous memory?" Which was the greater despot, the greater tyrant, Henry VIII., or James II.? James was dethroned not so much for his Popery even, as because he endeavoured to have the Papists tolerated. I do not attempt to justify his mode of doing what any honest man ought to do. But no king or queen that ever previously occupied the British throne, was questioned for doing similar acts to those for which he was dethroned; nor would he, but for his religion. And, if the present King of England was to become a Roman Catholic from a conscientious motive, the law of England would depose him, as effectually as the law of the year 1215, would have deposed any feudal lord in Europe. Is it not a deposition from the office of constable, not to say governor, in North Carolina, to deny the truth of the Protestant religion? Is not the enjoyment of civil rights, and the capacity of being elected into offices of trust or profit, and to the legislature, attempted to be confined to Protestants in New Jersey? Though upon looking closely at the clause, I suspect some one has cheated the persons who wished to exclude all but Protestants, and only permitted them in truth, to come in under the appearance of courtesy, for what it was meant, they should possess exclusively. Thus, we find, if Catholics did exclude those who differed from them in religion, from governing, and required their deposition, Protestants have done the same, and they still do the same—and do it, not only in England, but in the United States of America: and only that delicacy to individuals restrains me, I could show the American public, that it has and does produce very serious inconveniences to many excellent citizens. I do not advert to the old blue laws of Connecticut. I allude to laws and principles now in operation. I love America better than they do, who always boast of everything, and of every person; but my love is not that blind affection which leads to unmeaning rhapsody—but that fond attachment which prizes and would preserve all the good which now is, and would endeavour to find and acquire that which is wanting. I love America, as Brooke makes Gustavus Vasa love Dalecarlia:

> "With thee I sought this favourite soil: with thee
> These favourite sons I sought: thy sons, O Liberty!
> For even amid the wilds of life you lead them,
> Lift their low rafted cottage to the clouds,
> Smile o'er their heaths, and from their mountain tops

Beam glory to the nations.

. . . . . .

Are ye not marked by all the circling world,
As the great stake, the last effort for liberty?
Say! — is it not your wealth, the thirst, the food,
The scope, the bright ambition of your souls?
Why else have you, and your renowned forefathers,
From the proud summit of their glitt'ring thrones
Cast down the mightiest of your lawful kings,
That dared the bold infringement?

. . . . . .

Now from my soul I joy. I joy, my friends
To see ye feared; to see that e'en your foes
Do justice to your valours!''

Such is my love for America.—But that love and admiration shall not blind my mind's eye, if I be master of my powers. I shall not therefore say that any state in America does right in disfranchising a Catholic, merely because of his religion. I shall not say that you did right in styling America a Protestant country, for the phrase is suited only to a state which gives a preference to the Protestant religion. Would I, sirs, reason correctly if I were to say from these premises, that the Protestant religion teaches that if Catholics are in power they ought to be deposed, and if not in power they should not be elected thereto?

Would I reason correctly, if I asserted that the Protestant religion teaches that powerful Catholics ought to be assassiniated, because I find it to be a fact that the Duke of Guise was assassinated by Poltrot, and that Beza represents it as done very probably by the inspiration of Heaven? Am I in reviewing the miseries and the degradation of Ireland, to attribute to your religion all the murders of persons of my creed, committed under the pretext of love of God, by those of one like yours?—This is an account which we have yet to adjust.

Produce to me, sirs, one fact similar to the breach of the articles of Limerick, in Ireland: show me where Catholics broke faith which they plighted to Protestants. The head of the English church pledged his faith, and the faith of Protestant England, to the traitors, the Irish Papists, that if they laid down their arms, and surrendered the city of Limerick, and the other garrisons which they held, and acknowledged him to be king of Ireland, for he had not yet been recognised by them as king of Ireland; that country not being then under the dominion of the English Parliament, was not bound by the act of that body;—he would guarantee to them, freedom of conscience, full civil rights, and their property. Yet when their army was disbanded, they were persecuted for the profession of their faith;

they were stripped of their civil rights; they were plundered of their property; they were calumniated to the world. More than a century has elapsed, and this injustice continues; this violation of faith with Catholics is persevered in by the Protestant head of the English Church, by the Protestant Bishops, by the Protestant Peers, by the Protestant House of Commons. You retail the calumnies against the people who fly hither from this perfidious oppression, and without adducing one fact, you tell us that we keep no faith with heretics. Our forefathers kept their faith with them, with a vengeance. They kept it very unnecessarily too. Plighted faith creates mutual obligation, and perfidy on one side, discharges obligation on the other.

Dr. Dopping, the Protestant Bishop of Meath, undertook to preach a series of sermons, in Christ Church, Dublin, and did preach to prove that Protestants ought not to keep faith with Papists, and that the treaty of Limerick ought not to have been observed.

This theme is as irksome to me as it is to you. I should prefer bringing to view the kind offices of Protestants to Catholics. I have facts enough upon either side of the question. You have forced me to this line of exposure. I trust you will not compel me to go farther. I do not lay down my pen for want of facts, but through disgust. Your unfortunate article lies yet before me—I feel overwhelmed when I contemplate what still remains to be remarked upon.

I now, sirs, dismiss your portion respecting oaths, and murders, and depositions, and keeping faith with heretics and allegiance. You have upon those topics calumniated us, and exposed yourselves. I shall try how you will stand the test upon the subjects of divided allegiance and persecution. Yours, devotedly,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,
A native of Ireland.

LETTER VIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 22, 1825.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—We now enter upon a new topic—I come to examine the correctness of the following assertions in your article:

"1. A Roman Catholic can be in principle a faithful subject of a Protestant government, only when an unfaithful subject of the Pope.

"2. A consistent Papist, and a dutiful subject of a Protestant administration, must be incompatible, so long as the Pope shall claim jurisdiction over all Christen-

dom, and the Roman Church shall continue to maintain that faith is not necessary to be kept with heretics.

"3. The only reason why, among Papists, there are many good subjects of Protestant governments, arises from the fact, that there are so many in the Roman Church inconsistent with their profession, better than their profession, having no idea of all the doctrines and all the erroneous corruptions of the faith they acknowledge."

It will greatly facilitate our progress to know accurately the meaning of those assertions. To know the meaning, we should discover the object of their introduction. The first clauses of the sentence in which they are found, explain the object of introducing the above passages in your precious paragraph. These clauses are the following:—

"1. Such are the doctrines of a church, the members of which have raised an outcry against the intolerant spirit of the English government for not receiving them to a full share of its administration.

"2. They might as well accuse that government of cruelty, for banishing the wretched criminal to New Holland; or of illiberality, for punishing the man who traitorously conspires against his country."

Thus, your argument, if good for anything, is this—"The Roman Catholics cannot complain of being persecuted by Great Britain, for they are traitors who ought to be punished." In what, I ask, does their treason consist? You answer, "in not being faithful subjects of a Protestant government." In what does their want of fidelity to that government consist? "In saying that the Pope has jurisdiction over all Christendom." Also, "in the Roman Church maintaining that faith is not necessary to be kept with heretics."

Allow me here to pause—I write hastily, carelessly. I do not occupy a month in putting together three columns of a magazine—still I should lay down my pen were I to have written as much nonsense in a year as the few extracts now before me contain. Seldom, indeed, very seldom, have I been under the necessity of totally changing the structure of a sentence which I examined, in order to put forward clearly what the writer meant to convey. Yet I could not put this wretched compilation of yours into any form which would make it intelligible, or enable me to examine it as I ought, without such a process. A story which is told, I believe, of King Charles II., would apply well to your writing. A peasant having contributed greatly to his majesty's safety or amusement on some occasion, was asked what reward he expected: "I hope your majesty will make me a gentleman." "That," replied the king, "is no easy matter; there can be no question, but I can make you a knight or a baron, or even a duke; but I fear all the kings and emperors on earth could not make you a gentleman."

I can well guess, sirs, what is the drift of your propositions, but

certainly their logical meaning is not that drift. For instance, the following proposition might be taught with a safe conscience: "Faith is not necessary to be kept with heretics." Now the proposition is equivocal: the word faith has several meanings. Were I to understand by the word faith, the belief of religious doctrine, I would unhesitatingly maintain this proposition: "A man who knowingly and willingly keeps faith with heretics, offends God, and of course commits sin." A heretic is a person who denies deliberately and knowingly some truth which God has revealed. If I act in this way, I am unquestionably criminal for my deliberate denial of what I know God has revealed. Again, I could by faith mean fidelity to a lawful promise: now I could, with truth and moral rectitude, teach this proposition: "Faith is not necessary to be kept with heretics." The reason is plain: it is not necessary to keep a promise which has not been made—it is not necessary to make any promise to heretics. When I do not then make the promise of fidelity, I am not bound to keep this promise, which I have not made, either by act or by implication. What you ought to have written is the following: "The Roman Catholic Church teaches that Roman Catholics are not obliged to keep their fidelity to heretics." This is a very different proposition from either of the others, and is the one which you probably meant to give.

A countryman of mine acompanied a friend of his, who understood the language of France, to that kingdom. In passing through the streets, they observed a man carrying a pair of buckets, and crying, *Eau! Eau!* "What is that fellow saying?" asked the Irishman. "*Water,*" replied his friend, "he has it for sale in those buckets." "Would it not then be as easy for him to say *water*?" asked my countryman. Indeed, sirs, it is not over squeamishness in me to hope that in future you will write in such a manner as to express your ideas.

The proposition which we have transformed into a gentleman, is not true. Thus, this reason will not justify the British persecution of Roman Catholics, because a falsehood is no reason—it is only pretext. Allow me to ask, what jurisdiction does the Pope claim over Christendom? Is it spiritual? Is it temporal? Is there no distinction? We shall take the last first. The British government can only be justified by proving that the Pope claims temporal jurisdiction, either directly or by implication, and that Roman Catholics under them maintain his right thereto; or by showing that spiritual jurisdiction in the Pope is incompatible with their temporal right. Great Britain teaches that the power of the king is not complete without his being head of the church; and that to disobey him upon the head of ecclesiastical duty, is rebellion; and thus, that it

is treason to deny his headship, and to give to the Pope ecclesiastical authority. Is this assertion correctly constitutional? This was first made part of the law of England by 26 of Henry VIII., 1, 3, 13; and on May 5, 1535, the first of its victims, the priors of charter-houses of London, Axiholm and Belleval, together with a monk of Syon and a secular clergyman, suffered the death of traitors, at Tyburn, not for asserting the supremacy of the Pope, but for denying the supremacy of the king as head of the church, "thereby depriving the sovereign of the dignity, style, and name of his royal estate." On June 22d, Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, suffered the penalty of treason for denying, maliciously and traitorously, that the king was head of the church. In the indictment under which Sir Thomas Moore was convicted, the second charge was, "having traitorously sought to deprive the king of his title of head of the church;" and this upright chancellor suffered the pains of traitor, and had his head fixed on London Bridge, on the 6th of July. Thus, we see the criminality consisted in denying the title of ecclesiastical supremacy to the king, and thereby depriving him of a part of his royal name, title, and estate. Good sirs, am I awake? Is it in the United States of America such language as this is held? Are we, in the very Federal City, from a man who might be selected to preach religious instruction to the Senate of the people, the most free upon the earth, and who ought to be most jealous of the sanctuary of that freedom, the Senate chamber, to be taught that a man is unworthy of the compassion of his fellowmen; is deserving the punishment of a traitor, because he refuses to swear that the king of England ought to be obeyed as head of the church? Shade of the immortal Washington!—genius of Patrick Henry! can you slumber in peace whilst this doctrine is proclaimed? Jefferson and Adams, will you sanction the reproach of black treason against your venerable brother, Charles Carroll, who, together with you, still survives to welcome to our shores that warrior who was but one of the Popish leaders of a Popish army, that aided you to fling off the tyranny of the head of the church, who, as *The Declaration of Independence* states, plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people; who transported large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation, and tyranny, begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation, much less the supreme head on earth of Christ's church! Shall we now be told that no compassion is to be shown to a people whose conscience would not permit them to swear that, without any Gospel authority, without any reason but that of the strong, despotic power of such a

rapacious monster of lust and cruelty as Henry VIII., that man was head of the church, who in every stage of frightful oppressions, when petitioned for redress in the most humble terms, answered those petitions only by repeated injury? A man who excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and who endeavoured to bring upon our frontiers the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions? Yet all those acts of tyranny in America are but specks, which would be scarcely distinguished upon the surface of that calamitous ocean of evils under which my unfortunate country was merged, by the church of which this man was the mildest, the most lenient, the most meek and virtuous, apostolic head! ! ! And will the people of America—the descendants of men who would not submit to church tyranny—the descendants of men who would not submit to any tyranny—one-third of whom are Irishmen, or the descendants, or the connexions of Irishmen, and another large portion of whom are English or Scotch, or the descendants of English and Scotch who have suffered for not taking the oath of supremacy to the king of England—will they allow you to say they and their progenitors were traitors, because they would not swear this oath, which even your present chaplain to the Senate would not swear?

See whither your folly naturally leads you. In every nation, every government possesses the right of establishing a special religion; and whosoever will not obey the government in conforming to this religion, is a traitor. Is this the doctrine of the chaplain to the Senate of the United States of America? Public opinion implicates him with this principle. The Senate has selected him to teach them their religious duties. The chaplain preaches: "Whoever will not be a Protestant under a Protestant government, is a traitor—America is under a Protestant government: the Papists will burn us as soon as they can, for they are traitors in principle." This is what the Rev. Mr. Hawley has published. He knows who wrote it. I believe it was not written by him. What does the Constitution say? "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Upon this clear and solid principle of our constitution, no Roman Catholic owes allegiance to the king of Great Britain, and so far from being a traitor, and deserving punishment, he is but an oppressed and aggrieved man who has been unjustly plundered of his rights, which are unjustly withheld by a tyrannical government. And a Catholic who swears allegiance to the British king is bound to observe his oath to the same extent only, that a weak man who is confined by a strong robber is bound by an oath which he takes that he will not use any unconceded ad-

vantage of a partial liberty which he may obtain under the pledge of his oath. A regard to the sacred nature of the oath, binds him who takes it to observe every lawful promise which he makes even to his oppressor; but the reverence of the injured man for his oath, is not a remission to the invader of his right, nor a justification of his oppression. He cannot meet injustice by crime. He may decline swearing, and then use all lawful means to obtain his rights. But if he voluntarily puts some of those means out of his own power by bargaining not to use them, and swearing to refrain from their use, he is bound by his bargain and by his oath, but not otherwise.

Did the people of England and Ireland give to the king, in their original compact, a power to make them change their religion according to his caprice? Did the bishops and the barons of Runnymede give to John a power to make traitors of those who would refuse to make him supreme head of their church, that he might with greater facility indulge his beastly propensities, reward his obsequious panders, and put to death his honest and conscientious advisers? In vain do you look for such a clause in the laws of Edward, of Alfred, of Ina, or of even the Norman invaders. There is no such clause in the the Great Charter. Do you find its origin in the Gospel? You find it enacted by the vilest collection of slaves, that ever crouched before a voluptuous tyrant, under circumstances which took away even the semblance of liberty. You find it based upon flagrant injustice, raised in the midst of gibbets and scaffolds, cemented with blood, and decorated with all the emblems of legalized murder, from that of the conscientious chancellor to that of the unprincipled concubine. You are American citizens. Call you this a constitution?

This is a sweeping clause, with a vengeance. You tell the Pilgrims of New England that their progenitors were traitors—so Archbishop Laud told their fathers. You tell the Friends of Pennsylvania that their fathers were traitors—so the bishops of the Church of England told their fathers. You tell us, wretched outcasts of Irish Papists, that we are traitors. You imagine that we have been now so long accustomed to your insolence, that we should bear it with as much patience as the old cook expected from the eels, of whose restlessness she complained, as they presumed to writhe under her hand during the operation of being flayed alive, though she had been upwards of forty years in the practice, and they ought to have known it. God grant us patience: we have not been as yet ten years accustomed to your falsehood, though your fathers have been telling lies of our fathers during upwards of two hundred and fifty years; still we are not tamed down to acquiescence,

and we are so indocile, that as yet we have not been untaught the difference between what is a fact and what is calumny.

But to be serious: Are you not the most unfortunate of writers? In this land of true, and genuine, and rational freedom—in the very sunshine of well-regulated liberty—to presume to establish such a principle of despotism and intolerance! Sirs, I know well and intimately, the principles of the Church of England, and those of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. They are by no means similar even in their discipline. As for doctrine: you will excuse me from stating what is now unnecessary. In pure despotism and intolerance, I know no church which ever has approximated to the Church of England. I shall give you proof enough of my assertion. But not now. What then could have induced you to assimilate your church to it? Yours is a more respectable church. Yours is a more permanent church. Yours will survive the Church of England. What induced you to defend for its honour, the principle which would destroy the claim of the Protestant in France? Which justified the Inquisition? Which would drive from every country under a Catholic government, every one who was not a Catholic? For if the English or Irish Catholic is a traitor, because he disobeys his government, upon the score of religion—why shall not the Huguenot in France be justly condemned as a traitor? Why not condemn as a traitor the Moor in Spain? The Jew in Portugal? The Christian in Constantinople? Is not Europe, according to you, wrong in not aiding the Sublime Porte to repress those rebellious Greeks who reject the Koran? Are not the Christians in Asia wretched traitors who give but a divided allegiance to their legitimate sovereign who is head of the church as of the state? I call it a flagrant usurpation. I cannot but feel proud, that under all their sufferings my countrymen have never crouched to this slavery. I differ from the Scotch Presbyterians in doctrine—but I respect the consistency which made them reject the headship of the king, when they rejected the headship of the Pope. In vain do I look through the world to find a church similarly enslaved as that of England—Russia exhibits its nearest resemblance—Mahomedanism is its exact counterpart—the Sultan is the head of the church by the same right as he is temporal ruler, and he is equally a traitor who disobeys his religious order or his imperial firman. And you would seek to justify this? Yes! for you advocate the principle. Are you an American?

I am proud of America because she not only disavows, but condemns that principle of slavery. It is a heresy in religion; it is an absurdity in politics to assert, that because a man possesses political power there-

fore he possesses ecclesiastical jurisdiction: or that because he has spiritual power, he therefore has magisterial rights in the state. The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church and the principles of the American Constitution are in unison upon this subject. The doctrines of the Church of England and the principles of our constitution are in direct opposition upon the subject. And if you adopt the doctrine of the English Church, you are not good citizens of America. In framing the religion of which you are clergymen, it became necessary to reject some doctrines of the English Church. Her liturgy was mutilated; her canons made useless; and a vast portion of the homilies are blasphemies against our liberties. And is it possible that you still cling to all that has been thus rejected?

I have read with pleasure the account of the dinner given by our Congress to La Fayette on the first of this month, and I prized the intellect which gave to a toast frequently given on public occasions, its true and accurate expression. "The people, the source of all political power." Yes, and the declaration of the present king of Great Britain when he was Prince of Wales, is in perfect accordance with that principle expressed in the toast. His declaration was "That the crown was held by the king in trust for the people." The kingly power is political; it is derived from the people. They are the source of political power. But they are not the source of spiritual power, they are not the source of ecclesiastical power. The king of England did not obtain from them what they could not give. Roman Catholics believe that as political power is derived from the people—so spiritual and ecclesiastical power is derived from God. They saw no evidence of the fact that God had given this power to the king of England, therefore they would not swear that he possessed what was not given to him. Is this a crime? Am I a criminal when I assert that James Monroe, for whom and for whose office I have more respect than for all the British kings since the Norman conquest, and for their office, has no supremacy over any church? Shall I be called a traitor, if I refuse to fashion my religion according to his wish or opinion, though no subject of any king is more devotedly ready to obey him, than I am to obey with alacrity every constitutional order of the President of the Union or of the Governor of South Carolina? I am not then a traitor—I am not a criminal, because I refuse to acknowledge in the President or the Governor a power which is not in him. I was not a traitor; I was not a criminal in my native country, when I refused to swear that George III. was supreme head of the church. I saw its origin to be the usurpation of the eighth Henry. This usurpation was no evidence of right. It is a power which the people

could not give. I would be guilty of perjury, if I swore it. Produce evidence to show any reasonable man in this Union, that I ought to have sworn the oath of supremacy, and I will yield to you the palm of victory.

I shall put a case for you to solve. When our blessed Saviour taught in Judea, he was the supreme head of God's church. Ireland was not then under the Roman emperor's authority, she was governed by her native kings. Suppose an Irishman of that day was convinced of the divine authority of our blessed Lord, and told his fellow-countrymen that they ought to acknowledge the authority of Christ in matters of religion; that they should receive his decisions in their spiritual concerns; that they should form congregations and have their churches regulated according to his advice; that the persons to be admitted as the guides of their souls ought to derive from the Saviour their instruction, and their authority. Would you assert that this man might be justly taken up as a traitor; that he ought to be considered as a bad subject; that his allegiance was divided, and that he could be a faithful subject of the Irish king, only when an unfaithful subject of our Saviour? Yet here, sirs, you would say that the spiritual submission of this man, to the foreigner, did not interfere with his temporal or political allegiance to his native monarch. If you adopted the principle that spiritual obedience to a foreigner is a violation of allegiance to the state—do you not justify every nation which persecuted the citizens of subjects who adhered to foreign claimants of spiritual power? Thus you justify every persecutor of the early church. Do you violate the right of the Indian chief by persuading one of his tribe against the wish of that chief to become a Christian? Has that chief a right in conscience to punish that convert upon the plea that his allegiance to him is lessened by its being shared between him and one of your black coats? The argument is of the same value whether it be applied to an individual of a wandering tribe or the population of the Chinese empire. All the early martyrs of the church disobeyed kings and emperors in matters of religion: will you call them traitors, and say that they ought to have been put to death? Was Nero justified in beheading St. Paul? Did he only act as he ought in crucifying St. Peter? Was Pontius Pilate a meritorious governor, who conscientiously exercised his authority in putting Jesus Christ to death, upon the charge of his seducing the people from their allegiance to Cæsar? The charge which you make upon the Papists, is exactly the same charge which the Jews were in the habit of making against the Apostles. From that day to the present we have met it as we meet it now. We have a kingdom, it is true, in which we

pay no obedience to Cæsar; but our kingdom is not of this world—and whilst we render unto God the things that are God's, we render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. To the successors of the Apostles, we render that obedience which is due to the authority left by Jesus Christ, who alone could bestow it. We do not give it to the President, we do not give it to the Governor, we do not give it to the Congress, we do not give it to the legislature of the state—Neither do you, nor do they claim it—nor would we give it if they did, for the claim would be unfounded. We give to them everything which the constitution requires; you give no more—you ought not to give more. Let the Pope and Cardinals, and all the powers of the Catholic world united, make the least encroachment on that constitution, we will protect it with our lives. Summon a general council—let that council interfere in the mode of our electing but an assistant to a turnkey of a prison—we deny its right; we reject its usurpation. Let that council lay a tax of one cent only upon any of our churches—we will not pay it. Yet, we are most obedient Papists—we believe the Pope is Christ's Vicar on earth, supreme visible head of the church throughout the world, and lawful successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles. We believe all this power is in Pope Leo XII., and we believe that a general council is infallible in doctrinal decisions. Yet we deny to Pope and council united, any power to interfere with one tittle of our political rights, as firmly as we deny the power of interfering with one tittle of our spiritual rights to the President and Congress. We will obey each in its proper place, we will resist any encroachment by one upon the rights of the other. Will you permit Congress to do the duties of your Convention?

I shall now proceed to examine a few facts, the plain result of which must destroy your positions. Kings and emperors of the Roman Catholic Church, have frequently been at war with the Pope. Yet they did not cease to be members of the church, and subject to his spiritual jurisdiction, although they resisted his warlike attacks. Any person in the least degree acquainted with the history of Europe, can easily refer to several instances. The distinction drawn by our blessed Saviour, when he stood in the presence of Pilate was the principle of those rulers. They were faithful to the head of the church whose kingdom is not of this world, but they repelled the attack of an enemy to their rights. You, sirs, acknowledge the authority of bishops. Suppose a bishop under whom you were placed proceeded to take away your property; could you not defend your rights at law without infringing upon his spiritual authority? Are you reduced to the dilemma of being plundered, or of denying an article of your religion? Can you not keep your property

and deny the right of the bishop to take it away, and resist his aggression; at the same time that you are canonically obedient? Can you not be faithful to him as bishop, and to yourself as a man? Thus suppose the bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland claimed some right which he neither had by your church-law nor by the law of the state. You may and ought to resist the aggression. Yet you would not be unfaithful to him. Let the Pope be placed in the same predicament; I can be faithful to the Pope and to the government under which I live. I care not whether that government be administered by a Papist, by a Protestant, by a Jew, by a Mohammedan, or by a Pagan. It is then untrue to assert, as you have done, that a consistent Papist and a dutiful subject of a Protestant administration must be incompatible.

I intended adding some facts to prove my positions from history, but the printer tells me, I must defer to next week.

Yours, very devotedly,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,
A native of Ireland.

LETTER IX.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 31, 1825.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—In my last I promised to give some facts which would demonstrate the perfect distinction of temporal allegiance and spiritual obedience. Before I adduce the facts, let me distinctly lay down what Roman Catholics teach concerning the Pope's power: that is, what they are bound by their profession, as Roman Catholics, to believe. They believe that he has all the power which our blessed Saviour gave to St. Peter. They do not, as Roman Catholics, believe that he has one particle more. Tiberius and Nero were temporal rulers—St. Peter did not by virtue of his authority claim to be a partner of their throne, nor did he assert that their power was derived from him—nor did he assert that it could be taken away by him; and when Constantine became a Christian, Pope Sylvester, who claimed all the power which St. Peter possessed, never claimed to be the donor of power to Constantine, nor did he add to the authority which that Emperor had, and which he possessed and used as fully before his baptism as after. Constantine lost no temporal power by becoming a Christian; Sylvester gained no new power from God, from the circumstance of the Emperor's conversion. If the successors of Peter gained any temporal power, it was by the con-

cession of the people, or of princes; not by the appointment of God. If they were vested with any right of arbitration between kings, or princes, or people, in temporal or political concerns, it was by the act of those kings and princes and people. It was not by any new revelation of any article of faith, nor was it by entering into possession or use of any old right, from using or possessing which they had been forcibly restrained.

Thus, God never gave to St. Peter any temporal power, any authority to depose kings—any authority to interfere with political concerns. And any rights which his successors might claim for any of those purposes, must be derived from some other source. A Roman Catholic has no farther connexion with the Pope than as he succeeds Peter; Peter had none of those rights—as a Roman Catholic I know nothing of them in the Pope; he is equally Pope with or without them. Mr. McIlvain would not be the less pastor of his congregation for being chaplain to the Senate, and though he should lose his chaplaincy when his father will vacate his seat—he will not thereby cease to be pastor. The clergymen who are members of Congress are not, by holding their seats, less clergymen than if they had them not. Neither is the Pope less Pope because there is now attached to his office the possession of a territory which must be governed. Nor would he be less Pope though another Bonaparte should rob him and put him into prison. And Pius VII., under the lock of the man who died on St. Helena, was as much the head of our church, as was Gregory who made Europe bow, and shook her monarchs with terror.

Roman Catholics believe the Pope to be the successor of St. Peter, and therefore to be entitled to a supremacy of honour and jurisdiction, through the whole of the Christian world. This honour is only that which is due to a spiritual head—this jurisdiction is only in spiritual and ecclesiastical concerns. The American Constitution leaves its citizens in perfect freedom to have whom they please to regulate their spiritual concerns: but if the Pope were to declare war against America, and any Roman Catholic under the pretext of spiritual obedience was to refuse to oppose this temporal aggressor; he would deserve to be punished for his refusal, because he owes to his country to maintain its rights: and spiritual power does not and cannot destroy the claim which the government has upon him. Suppose a clergyman of England were convicted for some crime—for instance, Dr. Dodd, and he was ordered for execution; must the law be inoperative because the criminal is a clergyman? Think you that no one could be found in a Roman Catholic country to sentence or to execute a sentence upon a clergyman who was a criminal? All history testifies to the contrary. So too does all

history show that upon the same principle Catholic kings and princes, and peers and people have disobeyed improper mandates of the See of Rome, and have levied and carried on war against Popes, and still continued members of the church.

I shall give you a very few instances. In the first fact which I adduce you will find the spiritual grounds for the Pope's interference, which you will agree with me in pronouncing to be wholly inapplicable to our present state of society; and of no force whatever, as respects the United States.

When in the year 1202 John of England seized upon Arthur, the son of Geoffry, and imprisoned him at Rouen, after which this boy was never heard of: John having been strongly suspected of the murder of his nephew, was summoned, as Duke of Normandy, upon the accusation of the Bishop of Rennes, to answer to Philip of France, as his sovereign; having neglected to appear—Philip, in the presence of the Peers of France, pronounced sentence, "that whereas John, Duke of Normandy, in violation of his oath to Philip his lord, had murdered Arthur, the son of his elder brother, a homager of the crown of France, and near kinsman to the king, and had perpertated the crime within the seignory of France, he was found guilty of felony and treason, and was therefore adjudged to forfeit all the lands which he held by homage." King Philip and the Bretons, proceeded to execute this sentence by taking possession of the Duchy of Normandy; John was soon obliged to fly to England, and sought the aid of the Pope, who was the identical Innocent III., under whom was held that Council of Lateran, whose canons I have had to examine. Innocent sent two legates to King Philip, to require of him to desist, and to decide the controversy between the two kings. Mark now in his letter, the grounds of his right to interpose. After quoting the text from *Matthew* xviii. 15, 16, and 17, he proceeds:

"Now the king of England maintains that, by enforcing the execution of an unjust sentence, the king of France has trespassed against him. He has therefore admonished him of his fault in the manner prescribed by the Gospel, and meeting with no redress, has according to the admonition of the same Gospel, appealed to the church; how can we then, whom divine providence has placed at the head of that church, refuse to obey the divine command? How can we hesitate to proceed according to the form pointed out by Christ himself? We do not arrogate to ourselves any right as to judging the fee of the land or territory that belongs to the sovereign, the king of France. But we have a right to judge as to the sin committed, and it is our duty so to do, whoever may be the offender.

"It has moreover been provided by the imperial law, that if one of two litigant parties shall prefer the judgment of the Apostolic See, the other shall be bound to submit thereto, and to abide its judgment. But we say not this as if we would

thereby found our jurisdiction upon civil authority. God has made it our duty to reprehend the man who falls into mortal sin, and if he neglect our reprehension, to compel him to amend, by ecclesiastical censures.

"Moreover both parties, viz., the kings, have sworn to observe the late treaty of peace: and now it is plain, that Philip has broken that treaty, the cognizance of cases of perjury is well known, and is universally allowed to belong to the ecclesiastical courts. Wherefore, upon this ground also we have a right to call the parties to our tribunal."

Here we perceive the grounds on which the Pope claims a right to interfere: first, one which our Saviour meant for fraternal correction between individuals, and punishment of unjust aggressors—by the church. The manner of punishment is specified—ecclesiastical censures. Suppose I held all this to be true—suppose I did say that it regarded nations as well as individuals: assuming your principle of private judgment to ascertain the meaning of the text.—The Pope has this right as well as you have it. He has then proved his case from the Gospel, and by your principle the Pope has a right by the Scripture to act as he assumes, and you would be an enemy of the Scriptures and of God in denying it. My principle, however, will destroy his right. As a Roman Catholic I believe the Scriptures are not to be interpreted according to the caprice of the Pope, nor according to your caprice nor mine, but according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.—Now that consent confines the meaning of this passage to individuals, and does not extend it to governments. Wherefore, though I believe the exercise of the power was often salutary, I believe it was also often injudicious and injurious, and is applicable only to individuals. If it extends only to church censures, what danger is there to America from that cause? Sometimes the sovereign deprived the censured person of his property—but this was by his temporal power. The church had no such power.

As to the perjury: the law of Europe then gave its cognizance to the ecclesiastical courts. But the law of America does not. We have no dread upon this score. As to the imperial law, with that too we have no concern.

As a Protestant, you could not refute the scriptural doctrine of the Pope, nor evade its application. As a Catholic I assert it goes farther in its implication than the text warrants. So Philip of France thought, and disobeyed the mandate, and deprived John, of Normandy. Yet Philip never felt the church—he always continued to be a steadfast Papist.

Were I to follow up the enumeration of similar facts to this in the several countries of Christendom, I should write volumes, and each fact would more clearly prove, that the spiritual obedience which a Roman

Catholic owes to the Pope, does not in the most remote degree interfere with his fidelity to the government under which he lives; because the principle of the Roman Catholic is, that spiritual authority springs from God, and regards the concerns of a man's soul in respect to eternal things; temporal authority, though sanctioned by God, springs from the people, and regards the concerns of a man's well being as to the peace of this world and the goods of time. The spiritual ruler has no power to order the latter concerns, the temporal ruler has no power to order the former. But the principle of your much-admired English Church, vests the management of both concerns in the same tribunal, and thus give to the English oligarchy, a more unlimited jurisdiction that could be claimed by, or would be allowed to the most despotic monarch of Spain or Portugal.

Let us see a few more facts: when, in 1213, that same Innocent pronounced sentence of deposition from the throne of England against John himself, and committed its execution to Philip of France, John summoned his Catholic subjects; they were all Papists: notwithstanding the papal sentence, they came to the coast of Kent, sailed from Portsmouth on the 15th of April, captured Philip's squadron at the mouth of the Seine, destroyed the ships in the harbour of Fecamp, and burned the town of Dieppe. But, what the Pope's sentence never could effect John's own lust and despotism effected; he alienated the affections of his people from his throne—he made enormous exactions from the laity—he plundered the monasteries, and stripped the clergy, though they all supported him against the Pope and the King of France: yet not one of them fell under any censure, nor did any one of them, upon the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, commit the slightest act of infidelity to the Pope, by opposing the army of Philip. If you cannot understand this, it is because you do not know the principles of the feudal system which then prevailed, nor the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, which never change.

When John disgraced and degraded himself, by swearing fealty to the Pope, in presence of the Legate Pandulf, he was forced to render the crown of England tributary to Rome, by his own weakness, not by any principle of the Roman Catholic Church. The very men who had returned with him from his enterprise in France, would have defended him against a world in arms. He had 60,000 of them, flushed with victory, still at his side: but a tyrant is always weak, and he felt that the arms which they bore might be turned against himself, not because of the Pope's interference, of which they had been aware before they assembled, and to oppose the execution of which they assembled, and to pre-

vent the execution of which they had fought in the Channel and in France: but because of the crimes by which he was daily exasperating them. The people, as well as the barons, knew that John had acted illegally, tyrannically, and irreligiously, towards the Archbishop of Canterbury, (Langton,) and the other Bishops: they knew that John had incurred as well as deserved the censures of the church. To all this they made no opposition; but, when they found the King of France preparing to invade their country, and were called by their king to its defence, though he had deserved all the censures of the church, they felt it to be their duty, the Pope's declarations notwithstanding, to repel every invader. Thus, in fact, they were faithful subjects of an impious king, and were not unfaithful to the head of the Roman Catholic Church, although they refused to obey the mandate of the arbiter of kings under the feudal system, and still under that system it was lawful for them to disobey. If you know the nature of that system, you can explain those apparent incongruities. If you do not, I advise you, for the sake of your own character, to avoid writing about what you do not understand.

The reign of John is most fruitful in exemplifications. To pass over many others, we shall take one which regards the Great Charter. Primate Langton, upon his return, had required of John, before the removal of the excommunication, to swear, at Winchester, that he would abolish all illegal customs, restore to every man his rights, and revive the laws of the good King Edward.

The Barons met at St. Albans, under the presidency of the justiciary, Fitz Peter, and published the laws of Henry I., which were supposed to contain the provisions of Edward the Confessor. John, who found the barons had not followed him to France, which he intended to invade, returned from Jersey, and in his fury was about to do military execution upon the peers, who had published those laws, which he never seriously intended to have enforced. The Primate restrained him, and insisted that if they were charged with crime, they should be tried by their peers. The barons met on the 25th of August, at St. Paul's, in London, Langton read to them the provisions of the charter of Henry I., commented upon them, enforced the necessity of restraining the king's lawless tyranny by its enactments, and prevailed on them to swear to each other, to die in defence of their liberties, sooner than make any surrender thereof.

On the 20th of November, 1214, the barons assembled at the Abbey of St. Edmunds, after having, in several previous meetings, fixed the special demands which they were to make: all having been made ready

and committed to writing. One by one, each advanced to the high altar, and took a solemn oath to God and to his peers, to withdraw his allegiance from John as a tyrant, should he refuse to grant the claim of their and the public rights.

On the Feast of the Epiphany, January 6th, 1215, exactly six hundred and ten years ago, five hundred and sixty years and six months before *The Declaration of American Independence*, the bishops and other barons followed the king to the Temple, in London, where he had shut himself up, and there presented their claims. John threatened, and required of them to assure him, under their hands and seals, that they would never again have the insolence to make such a demand; three only were found base enough to comply, viz.: the Bishop of Winchester, the Earl of Chester, [and] Lord William Brewer.

Finding them obstinate, the king gave, as his sureties, to give a favourable answer at Easter, the Primate, the Bishop of Ely, and the Earl of Pembroke. Knowing that the bishops were the portion which had most influence, the insincere monarch used every effort, during the respite thus obtained to detach them from the confederation. On the 15th of January, by a charter, he divested himself as of rights, of several usurped powers which he and his predecessors had assumed in ecclesiastical concerns. He also applied to the Pope to aid him. He made a public vow to wage war against the infidel oppressors of the suffering Christians in Greece and Asia, and claimed, as a crusader, the aid of the church for the preservation of his rights, whilst he should be engaged in preparing for, and prosecuting so sacred an undertaking. Having thus hypocritically flung the mantle of religion over his iniquity, he, on the 2d of February, ordered the sheriffs of the several counties to assemble their freemen, and cause them to swear the oath of allegiance to him. On the 19th of March, the Primate, Langton, received a letter from the Pope, complaining of the injustice of refusing to John the rights which had been peaceably possessed by his brother Richard, and by his father Henry, charging the Archbishop with seditiously encouraging the subjects against their monarch, and commanding him to exert his authority for their reconciliation. The barons received another letter from the Pope, in which he censures them for demanding violently as a right, what they might have asked as a favour. He promised, that if they behaved with humility and moderation, he would intercede for them, and obtain from the king any reasonable boon. He then annuls the proceedings of the confederation, and under penalty of excommunication, forbids any future confederacy. Thus John thought himself secure from his popish subjects. Easter came.

But the English Papists of 1215 knew their rights just as well as did the American Congress of all religions in 1775. The bishops and the barons met. No excommunications could destroy their inalienable rights. Neither a Pope nor a general council, could dictate to the British Barons nor to the American people, the terms of the compact between them and their temporal governments. Before a Pope was commissioned, before a general council was assembled, the God of nature regulated the rights of man in the social and civil state. The commission of St. Peter gave him no authority to regulate the manner in which kingdoms should be governed.

Pandulf, the Pope's legate, and the Bishop of Exeter, contended that the Primate was bound by the Pope's order to excommunicate the barons. The Archbishop replied, that the king had brought in foreign troops to oppress his people, and unless they were forthwith removed, he would excommunicate them; and that to the utmost of his power, he would oppose the oppression of the liberties of England. Runnymede exhibited the value of the papal interference with Roman Catholics, who still were faithful to the head of their church, but who acknowledged in him no right to interfere in their temporal government. At one side was the king, with the Pope's legate, eight bishops who had been drawn away by the means which I stated, and fifteen gentlemen. On the other side stood Fitzwalter, "the general of the army of God, and of the holy church," accompanied by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the rest of the English Bishops, several abbots, and the host of the British nobility, together with their knights and esquires; and the monarch was obliged to submit.

I shall not dwell upon the resistance of the Roman Catholic Bishops and Barons, to the repeated attempts made by the king, with the aid of the Pope, to annul the Great Charter which was thus obtained. All these, and a thousand other facts in history, plainly prove the distinction between spiritual obedience and temporal allegiance. The British Catholics gave the latter to Elizabeth, a Protestant Princess, when she was excommunicated by the Pope, yet she hanged them for paying him spiritual obedience. Thus, it is clear, that a Roman Catholic might be a faithful subject of a Protestant government, at the same time that he is a faithful subject of the Pope, as you are pleased to express yourself.

Were the Canadians so unfaithful to their Protestant King George, as to make it safe for our militia captains to cross the line into their territory? Why did our captains refuse to go over? They knew the Canadians were faithful Roman Catholics. Were the Canadian Papists unfaithful to the persecuting British Protestant government in 1775?

Had the Pope's interference any influence upon the popish Barons of England, who opposed the Papist William Wallace? Had it any influence upon the popish adherents of the Papist Bruce? What influence had it upon the Irish chieftains, all Papists, who remonstrated with Pope John upon the misconduct of King Edward II. of England, and who told his holiness that they recognised no right in him, or in the King of England, to regulate their temporal government? Sirs, you should study history, before you presume to lay down as correct principles, assumptions which all history proves to be false?

I am aware, that, for its own purposes, the English Church and State has corrupted history; but it is only the light and hasty, and prejudiced reader, that can be imposed upon by the deceptive mass of muddy falsehood. Very little application of the rules of criticism is necessary to purify the collection. King Henry VIII. knew the history of King John, and Primate Langton, and of Henry II., and Primate Becket, and of many other kings and bishops; and, as he had many delicate affairs to manage, he thought an obsequious man, like the complying Thomas Cranmer, would do well as a nominal Primate, whilst he could very well be Pope. In this he was not impolitic: he was then at full liberty to plunder, and to marry, and to behead, and to burn, as he thought proper; and, from that day to this, the English Church, with one exception, has been the most sleek, well-fed, obsequious, courtly church in the world: that troublesome quality of independence is unknown; all is perfect harmony.

I have no doubt you would like to see such another gentleman-like system in America; but, sirs, I promise you, with God's help, you never will. The people here, sir, have too much good sense to permit the President, or even the Senate, to add the influence of your church or mine, or any other to the power of the Executive. When the people shall be guilty of this folly, their liberties are lost, and they will deserve their bondage.

I am, sirs, yours, devotedly,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,

A native of Ireland.

LETTER X.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 4, 1825.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—It is with great reluctance and extraordinary pain, I come to examine the last but most extensive and most revolting part of your article.

My belief is, that God never gave to any Pope, nor to any other Bishop, nor to any other clergyman, nor to any state, nor to any human tribunal, any power, directly or indirectly, to inflict any corporal or temporal punishment upon man for heresy or religious error. He did give to the church, and of course to the Bishops who compose her tribunal, a power to cut off delinquents by excommunication, a power to censure, to reprove, to deprive of spiritual authority, to refuse sacraments, and such like. But he never gave to the church any other power of punishment. That same great Being reserves to himself exclusively, the power of inflicting punishment in the next life, because he only can with certainty decide who is culpable.

We may and do know with certainty what he has taught, and therefore what he requires of us to believe and to practise—but we cannot know with certainty, that they who are in error are wilfully and culpably so, because we do not know what is secret from all others perhaps, but from God and themselves, viz., the exact state of their conscience, upon which their moral accountability rests. I have not the least doubt of the truth of all that the Roman Catholic Church teaches to be doctrine revealed by God. Neither have I the slightest doubt that everything opposed thereto must be error. But the culpability of others does not rest upon my conviction, but upon their own. I know they are in error; but I do not know whether they are culpably so. I hope for the more charitable alternative, that they are not culpable. It would be not only folly for me to attempt to decide upon individual cases, but it would be of no use, for my opinion will not decide their fate; that fate must be decided by the judgment of God. It would be presumption in me to decide upon what I do not know. Charity leads me to hope their dispositions are good: but truth compels me to know that they are in error. They do not hear the church, they must be to me as heathens and publicans. But I am not called upon to hate or to persecute heathens and publicans. I am commanded to have no communion with their religion or with their crime. But I am called upon also to love themselves, and to serve them when I can.

All this is plain to me: This is to me the law and the gospel. This is what I have been taught in the Roman Catholic Church; this is what she commissioned me to teach; this is what I have taught; this, as I shall answer for the assertion at the tribunal of God, is what I have always read, heard, and known to be the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

Some divines of that church have examined whether it is lawful for temporal rulers to make laws against heresy as an evil, and to punish those who would establish, or perpetuate it, and they have been divided in their opinions. The church has never decided for or against either opinion. You might as well attribute to the Supreme Court of the United States, and thus to the Union at large, every opinion urged by a lawyer in that court, as attribute to councils and to the church, every opinion of every divine.

The court is chargeable only with its decisions. The church is accountable only for its decisions. The court is not answerable for opinions hazarded by those who plead in its presence. The church is not answerable for the opinions of every person who writes upon religion, and maintains or controverts opinions upon which perhaps God has never given any revelation, and respecting which, therefore, the church claims no doctrinal jurisdiction.

Now, sirs, a more atrocious and calumnious article of vulgar language and bitter falsehood, never was published, than you gave in the following precious passages:

"The Roman Catholic Church is, of its own nature, a persecuting church. Persecution on account of religion, has from time to time, indeed, been the disgrace of other denominations: but it arose more from the age than their tenets. The doctrines of other denominations are all directly opposed to persecution. It can never appear among them but when they are inconsistent with themselves. In the Romish Church, on the contrary, the more consistent she is with herself, the more of the spirit of persecution will she manifest. Her leading principles enforce it; and when she abstains from it, her peaceful conduct proceeds either from want of power, or want of Roman Catholic faith."

Good God! sirs! What shall I do with this mass of falsehoods? Have you heads? Do you know anything of history? Have you hearts? Do you not tremble when you look upon this appalling denunciation of the great bulk of Christendom? Have you any remnant of shame? How can you go abroad in the streets of the city of Washington, the largest division of whose inhabitants are Roman Catholics? Do you believe that their leading principles enforce persecution? Their leading principle is to believe all that God has revealed, and that they are not bound to believe more than what he has revealed. Certainly you

will not say that the great majority of the Christian world, which has at all times been, as it now is, Roman Catholic, has so far degraded the character of God and destroyed the great principles of Revelation, as to assert that God revealed that one man should persecute another upon the score of religion, when he commanded all men to love one another, and then published this command as to the peculiar precept of the Redeemer; when they also published the rebuke of the Saviour to the over-zealous disciples who would call down fire upon the unbelieving cities: when they published his injunction to Peter, not to strike with the sword. These are an exhibition of the leading principles of the Roman Catholic Church. Is the spirit of persecution consistent with those principles? Does the man who abstains from persecutions want the faith upon which those principles are raised: from which they spring! "Love your neighbour as yourself. Q. Who is my neighbour? A. All mankind, even they who differ from us in religion." This is the principle which the Catholic Church enforces. I take up the *Catechism* of this Diocess, which in principle agrees with every other: which has been examined at Rome, and sanctioned as teaching the doctrines of the universal church now and at all times in communion with that See. In it, at page 35, I find the following questions and answers:

Q. How does a person sin against the love of God?

A. By every sin, but particularly by mortal sin.

Q. How does a person sin against the love of our neighbour?

A. By injuring him in any respect, or by not assisting him when able, in his spiritual or corporal necessities.

Q. Who is my neighbour?

A. Every human being.

Q. Am I to consider those persons who are opposed to the true religion, as my neighbours?

A. Yes, undoubtedly; to punish for voluntary error is the prerogative of God, to show mercy and kindness to his fellow-mortals, is the duty of man. (*Luke* x. 37).

Again, sirs, in pages 44, 45, I have the following questions and answers:

Q. To how many commandments may the ten commandments be reduced?

A. To these two principal commandments, which are the two great precepts of charity:—Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. This do, and thou shalt live.—(*Luke* x.; *Mark* xii,).

Q. How am I to love God?

A. By keeping his word, that is, by fulfilling his commands.

Q. How am I to love my neighbour as myself?

A. As you would, says Christ, that men should do unto you, do you also to them in like manner.—(*Luke* vi. 31.).

Q. What particular duties are required of me by that rule?

A. Never to injure your neighbour, by word or deed, in his person, property, or character; to wish well to him, and to pray for him as far as you are able, in his spiritual and corporal necessities.

Q. Am I also obliged to love my enemies?

A. Most certainly. Love your enemies, says Christ, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you. (*Luke* vi.; *Matt.* v.,).

So that you see we are obliged to pray for you. I shall do you another neighbourly act. I lay for your instruction and spiritual benefit, the following extract from the same *Catechism* before you:

Q. Is it lawful to tell an innocent or jocose lie, or to tell a lie for a good purpose?

A. No lie can be lawful or innocent; and no motive, however good, can excuse a lie; because a lie is always sinful and bad in itself. (*John* viii. 44.)

Q. What else is forbidden by the eighth commandment?

A. Backbiting, calumny, and detraction; and all words and speeches hurtful to our neighbour's honour or reputation.

Q. What is commanded by the eighth commandment?

A. To speak of others with justice and charity, as we would be glad they should speak of us; and to witness the truth in all things.

Q. What must they do, who have given false evidence against a neighbour; or who have spoken ill of him; or injured his character in any respect?

A. They must repair the injury done him, as far as they are able; and make him satisfaction by restoring his good name as soon as possible; otherwise the sin will not be forgiven them.

When you comply with your duty, I trust the Archbishop of Baltimore will give me faculties to absolve you; but unless you repent, and express your sorrow, and as far as you are able, make satisfaction for the injury done to us, neither my absolution, nor the archbishop's absolution, nor that of the Pope, could do you any benefit.

But, sirs, as you might not be satisfied with our American Catholic doctrine, I shall give you French Catholic doctrine. A very respectable and highly valued French work, is the *Catechism* of Mont-

pelier. The edition of this work printed at Paris in 1739, in three volumes, 12mo., has the following questions and answers.—Vol. II. page 69:

S. 3. *De l'amour du prochain.*

D. La charite nous oblige-t-elle a aimer notre prochain?

R. Oui. Elle nous oblige a l'aimer comme nous-memes.—(*Matt.* xxii. 39 and 40; *Rom.* xiii. 8, *et suiv.*)

D. Qui est notre prochain?

R. Ce sont tous les hommes; les Chretiens, les heretiques, les infideles, et meme nos plus grands ennemis.—(*Matt.* v. 38, *et suiv.*—*Luc.* x. 27, a 37.—S. Augustin, *Ser* 2, *sur le Pseaume* 25; *N.* 2 *Sur le Pseaume* 54, *N.* 4, *et Serm.* 8 *sur le Pseaume* 118, N. 2.)

Of the love of the neighbour.

Q. Does charity oblige us to love our neighbour?

A. Yes. It obliges us to love him as ourselves.

Q. Who is our neighbour?

A. All men—Christians, heretics, infidels, and even our greatest enemies.

Thus, sirs, in any explanation of the Roman Catholic doctrines which I have ever seen, so far from persecution of any person being enforced by the church, I always found charity enforced. And until you can produce the principles which enforce persecution, and prove that they are principles of the Roman Catholic Church, I must treat you as a calumniator of the great body of Christians when you assert, "that the Roman Catholic Church is of its own nature a persecuting church;" "that in the Romish Church, the more consistent she is with herself, the more of the spirit of persecution will she manifest;" "that when she has power to persecute and abstains from it, her peaceful conduct proceeds from want of Roman Catholic faith." Now, sirs, one request which I presume to make is, that you will be good enough to inform the public, also, how "the Romish Church" can "be in want of Roman Catholic faith."

As a Freethinker, and others, complain of the length of my letters, I shall not proceed farther now, but will reserve to my next the examination of your other assertions.

I am, sirs,

Yours devotedly,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,

A native of Ireland.

LETTER XI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 10, 1825.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—In my last, I mentioned the reluctance with which I approached to examine the last portion of your calumnious article. I must give a more appropriate name to my feeling. I shall call it disgust. You have for the criterion by which you estimate the feelings of others, generally speaking, your own feelings. If you argue what mine ought to be by analogy from what your own are, you are not likely to give me credit for the truth of my declaration, that my disgust arises not so much from the view of the cruelty of some Catholics, which, of course, I condemn, as from the necessity of stirring up the enormous mass of Protestant cruelty which I would have left untouched, but for your wanton and injudicious provocation, which leaves me no choice. You made grievous and specific charges which cannot be refuted without entering into the enumeration of particulars.

Your semblance of argument is the weakest exhibition of impotent malice which has ever fallen under my eye. Your portion on persecution consists of two parts. 1. A general assertion, which I have examined in my last. I call it assertion, because it is unsupported by any, even apology for reason. You asserted that the spirit of the church to which I have the happiness to belong, was the spirit of persecution. I quoted two as specimens of ten thousand similar documents, to prove that its spirit was that of charity. Charity is not persecution. You connect with this falsehood, by way of corollary, the following clumsy passage:

> "Thus it has come that the persecutions of the Romish Church have exceeded in malignity, cruelty, perseverance, extension, and continuance, not only those of all other sects, (for here there is no comparison,) but even the anti-christian violence of the heathens."

Now, sirs, be kind enough to inform the American public how excess can be found without comparison. Can you say which of two lines exceeds another in length before you have compared them? Can you say that the persecutions of the Romish Church have exceeded those of all other sects, before you have compared one persecution with the other? I am certain the fault which you have committed, is that which you have here so very unwittingly and unintentionally blundered into expression. Yes, sirs, you have made your assertion without having made the comparison; and you have forced me to compare against my inclination.

After this assumed corollary from a false proposition, you proceed to exemplify. You give us the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day in Paris. You say that rejoicings were had in Rome for the massacre. You say that Gregory XIII. published a jubilee to return thanks to God for the murders then committed upon the French Protestants. You say that this was consistent with our doctrines,—that it arose directly from the Romish faith. I have yet so much of your production to examine, that I had better dispose as quickly as possible of its minor parts.

Here you assume to argue the consistency of the fact with the Romish doctrine, from the Pope's infallibility: "The Pope was certainly consistent in his savage conduct, as any one must know by considering not only his infallibility, but the tenets of the church over which he presided." Your argument, put into form, would be this:

"If the tenets of the church were consistent with savage conduct, viz., rejoicing and thanks for the massacre of Protestants, — the Pope who rejoiced and gave thanks for such massacre was consistent with those tenets in his savage conduct.

"But the tenets of the Romish Church were consistent with this savage conduct."

I deny that the tenets of the church are consistent with such savage conduct; hence, until you shall have proved your proposition, your argument will not be perfect. I have shown, in my last, the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church to be not consistent with persecution. This, of itself, proves the falsehood of your assertion. I defy you, or any other person, to show me any tenet of the Roman Catholic Church which either justifies or warrants persecution, or thanksgiving and rejoicing for murder of persons because they are not Catholics; and I do unhesitatingly call the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day murder. The object of the rejoicing is misrepresented by you. The circumstance of the jubilee is one of the most palpable falsehoods that ever issued from the press, as we shall find upon examination of the fact.

To prove the proposition which I have thus denied, your argument is brought to this:

"1. If the Romish church believes the Pope to be infallible, all his public conduct must be consistent with her tenets.

"2, 1. But she does believe the Pope to be infallible.

"2, 2. But this infallible Pope did conduct himself publicly in a savage manner.

"3. Therefore the tenets of the Romish church are consistent with savage conduct."

In the first part of the argument it was attempted from the assumption that the church held wicked tenets to prove that the Pope's con-

duct was consistent therewith. Now we have the wicked tenets proved by the conduct of the Pope—whilst Roman Catholics deny every one of the propositions in all their parts. We deny that we hold, or that the church ever held such tenets. 1. We say that even if it were a tenet of our church, that the Pope is infallible in giving doctrinal decisions, it does not follow that all his acts are in accordance with his decisions. I recollect an anecdote respecting a judge, of this state, a countryman of mine, who in court had sentenced a man to pay a heavy fine and to be imprisoned, and in passing the sentence, lectured him in good set terms for having had the weakness of losing his temper and making a violent assault upon another citizen, when his rank and station in life should have caused him to give good example. His honour, upon returning home, observed an egregious mistake had been made by some bricklayers whom he had at work, and forgetting his own lecture, threw some brickbats at the workmen, probably knowing from instinct that his missiles would ascend more quickly than he could. Our Popes, even if infallible in their doctrinal decisions, might answer as the judge did, when reminded of his lecture—"Yes, 'tis true, God Almighty enables us to tell what is correct for the public benefit, but permits us to act against our own principles, to prove to us that our wisdom is from him, and our weakness from ourselves. We are not gods." Thus, suppose the infallibility of the Pope were a tenet of our church—the doctrinal decisions of the Pope, not his public or private acts, would give the criterion of our faith. Now we defy anyone to produce a single doctrinal decree of any Pope in favour of persecution for heresy. What I mean by heresy is error concerning the doctrines of religion, which does not disturb the peace of civil society, nor corrupt public morals. In these cases the doctrines of our church are in accordance with the doctrines of the several constitutions of the United States. "The civil magistrate is bound to preserve peace. He is bound to protect public morals." Any infraction of either is punishable at common law—many of them under special statutes. "The magistrate has not received the sword in vain, he is the vicegerent of God to punish the wicked." Heresy, as it is a mere religious error, is not punishable by any human tribunal with the infliction of corporal or pecuniary suffering—but if thereby the peace of society is disturbed, or the public morality corrupted, the civil magistrate, who by the ordinances of society has the care of guarding both, is during his lawful continuation in office, vested by God with the power of punishment necessary therefor. This is his office—not that of the church. Thus, supposing the Pope to be infallible in his doctrinal decisions, and to have decided that it was not contrary to faith, that

magistrates had the power of punishing the persons, who, under pretence of religious freedom, disturbed the public peace, or corrupted the public morality, he would only have decided what every state in the Union holds to be true. This is not teaching that heretics ought to be persecuted; but it is teaching that malefactors ought to be punished. The application of the principle belongs to the civil magistrate, not to the church. The acts of any Pope are very different from doctrinal decisions. 2, 1. Roman Catholics do not hold as one of their doctrines, that the Pope is infallible. All the premises then being false, your argument is totally without value.

The facts of the French massacre have been so frequently examined, that to any man having the most ordinary knowledge of history, they must be well known; whoever knows them will easily see that the massacre was no part of our religion, and was not a religious persecution, but a political series of murders. The revocation of the edict of Nantz, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, and the Inquisition, are so constantly the theme of declamation, that I must once for all take them up, but not until after I shall have examined your assertion of the fact that the Roman Catholic church was guilty of more extensive persecution than all sects of Protestants. I shall commence with that sect from which you are sprung, the Church of England. I deny *in toto* this assertion of yours:

> "The horrible massacres of St. Bartholomew's day in different parts of France, nd the more extensive and exterminating which followed the revocation of the edict of Nantz, were perfectly consistent with the Roman Catholic doctrine: and in their essential features, must be justified by every consistent member of the Romish Church."

I have before shown its falsehood. I now assert that the Church of England, from the first moment of its becoming Protestant to the present day, has without a single moment's intermission, been everywhere a persecuting body. I am prepared for the investigation which this assertion might be calculated to challenge. I shall not flinch from its brunt. I have the disgusting accumulation of proof at hand. The American public shall have the documents if it will. I do not wish to produce them in detail.—You have wantonly urged me to state what I did not seek to publish. Now that we have entered the lists, I again warn you, for the sake of charity, not to drive me to the fight. Even the ethics of a military college should urge you to avoid a hopeless contest. Take up your gauntlet and I shall withdraw—but if you will not, I shall give you no quarter. I shall give you facts until your ears tingle, your eyes involuntarily close, your heart shrinks, and you would give a

world that you had not provoked the exhibition. Take for the present a short extract from the *Spirit of Religious Controversy*, written a few years since by the Rev. Dr. Fletcher, a respectable priest of the English Catholic Church:

THE TOLERANT POLICY OF THIS COUNTRY

"In this country, the interests of the state became blended, it was thought, with the interests of the reformation; and the fanaticism of the legislature adopted, as a fundamental principle of policy, as horrible an error, as any, that disgraced the civil code of a Dioclesian. It decreed the wisdom of persecution. Its enlightened liberality, very piously, sanctioned the frightful maxim, that cruelty to Catholics 'would much advance the glory of God.;'[67] and with a horrible, though proper consistency with such a maxim, its zeal legalized every expedient; enforced every method, that could enable cruelty to attain so desirable an end. Consult our penal statutes against popery. It will be found, that the laws of half the persecutors and tyrants, who have disgraced humanity, are less cruel and vexatious. They were, as Mr. Burke remarks, 'a complete system, full of coherence and consistency, well digested, and well contrived in all its parts: a machine of wise, and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them, of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man.'[68] In the pious work of persecuting popery, the ecclesiastical establishment, whose distinguishing characteristic should be benevolence, concurred with the civil power; it sanctified the horrors of persecution, and rendered the hatred of Papists, a source of distinguished merit. I might cite many examples of this illiberality; but I will produce only one, which is expressive of the general temper of the Protestant clergy, during the course of above two hundred years. During the reign of James the First, when an alleviation was proposed of the punishments of Roman Catholics, the meek Archbishop of Canterbury, in his expostulation with that prince, told him, 'that such a measure would call down, upon him and his kingdom, God's heavy anger and indignation.' In this age of liberality, it is not easy for moderation to conceive, the extravagance of the sanctified violence, with which the zeal of Protestantism assailed us; and, effectually, kept alive the animosity of the public. The pulpit re-echoed with abuse; and the press groaned with lies. Language had not words sufficiently harsh to reprobate us: nor the imagination images sufficiently horrible to represent our wickedness. That divine repository of maledictions, threats, and reproaches, — the Apocalypse was too scanty to furnish with bigotry epithets: or ill-will, expressions, strong enough, to urge prejudice to hate us. The chief ingredient of Protestant piety, and Protestant orthodoxy, during these ages, was enmity to Popery. Speaking of the time of Queen Elizabeth, Dr. Heylen says, 'Not to speak of private opinions, nothing was more considered in them, than the zeal against popery.' And, at a subsequent period, Bishop Bedel mentioning the manner in which the Protestants usually treated us, he says, 'They give loose to their pens and tongues; and what they say, is only a series of calumnies and injurious language.'[69] Even Burnet himself, to whose mildness and candour, Popery owes so little, acknowledges, in his life of the good Bishop, the truth of this

[67] See Rushworth's *Col.* vol. i.
[68] Letter to Sir H. Langrishe.
[69] *Sermons.*

observation. I will not crowd my page with more lengthy quotations; but as the erudition, and, in an instance of this nature, the candour of Bayle render his testimony unexceptionable in regard of the writings of Protestants; I will just add, that he asserts, that the controversy of our Protestant writers, consists only in reproaching the Catholic, with what he does not believe, and in animating their own party to insult him.

'In malice it begun, by malice grows;
He (Luther) sowed the serpent's teeth; an iron harvest rose.' '' — *Dryden.*

Speaking of the Reformation:

''When I reprobated our penal statutes, perhaps, it would have been wise to have remarked that they had not, in general, the poor apology for their enactment, that they were passed in the hour of danger; or enforced against subjects, whose loyalty was precarious. In general, they owed their enactment to the wantonness of cruelty, and to the industry of fanaticism; and were enforced against subjects of acknowledged loyalty; who had, on every occasion, obeyed every call of their ungrateful monarchs; and assisted a Protestant government to repel Catholic invaders. They were enacted and forced against men, whose only crime was, that they believed what their reason conceived true; and revered what their conscience told them was divine. — They were enacted against men, for believing what they thought proper; by men who professed, that to believe what each one thinks proper, is the privilege of nature, reason, and religion. However, peace to all those whose narrow policy or liberal piety, thought it wise and meritorious to insult humanity; or, to violate the principles of Protestantism for the good of the reformation! The days of persecution have passed away; and we forgive the persecutors. The discernment of modern policy, and the wisdom of modern piety, have, at length, discovered, that it is reasonable and religious to be just to Roman Catholics, and that moderation may, possibly, create as good subjects, as the sword of persecution. How much is humanity indebted to the man, whose bold and enlightened goodness, first ventured to attempt the solution of the interesting problem! He merits the first tribute of Catholic gratitude. But, to him; to the beneficence of the best of princes; to the enlarged wisdom of the legislature, every tribute is due, which gratitude can offer. It is due, also, to several of that class of men, to the morose prejudices of whose predecessors, the Roman Catholic owed so little. Several of the Protestant clergy have our warmest thanks. They felt the horrid impropriety of our bloody statutes; and, nobly, stood forward to urge their abolition. They acted, on that interesting occasion, as Christian pastors should do; they acted as Christian pastors; as Christian philosophers; and as Christian men. May their successors in the ministry resemble them! And may the Catholic, in ages yet to come, pay them the same tribute of gratitude which we do.''

Read this, sirs: turn to those penal laws. Read the history of the cruelties of Nero, and of every one from him to Dioclesian. Place all the victims of those Pagan persecutors on one side; add to them every wretch whom the Inquisition has burned for sodomy, for bestiality, for sacrilege, and the other crimes for which they would have been hanged or burned in every civilized nation of the world, for those are chiefly the crimes of which that tribunal has cognizance—add all those condemned and executed for heresy, in any court of the Inquisition, and I

pledge myself to set against the collected mass, an equal number of Roman Catholics who have suffered from the persecutions of your favourite church. I shall be gratified if your good sense shall for once prevail over your virulence, but, disgusting as the catalogue must prove I prefer giving it publicity to permitting you and others to calumniate with impunity, that church which first taught America practical liberality.

Would to God, sirs, I could for the last time subscribe myself,

Devotedly yours,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,

A native of Ireland.

LETTER XII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 10, 1825.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—As I am anxious to conclude these letters, I shall not encumber them with either the long account which I intended to give of the Inquisition: nor yet with the explanation of the circumstances attending the murder of the French Protestants, at the length which I originally contemplated. But in my next, which I mean to be my last to you, I shall shortly treat of both those topics, and of your concluding assertion. In this I shall confine myself to giving you a very few instances to prove my former assertion, respecting the persecution of Catholics by the British Protestant government, and when I select a very few out of the thousands of instances, it is only to teach you how forbearing the writers on my side of the question have been, who, perpetually worried by snarls like yours, have had it in their power, if you were not what Hudibras would call *cynoptic*, to shame you into silence. I shall omit the disfranchisement of a whole nation, because they would not desert the religion which their progenitors professed during twelve previous centuries, and which they believed to be true; to gratify the private malice of a disappointed monster of filth and cruelty, "who spared no woman in her lust, nor no man in his anger." Allow me, sirs, to make a comparison between Spain and England. Suppose against the fact, Spain to be actuated only by religious motives in establishing the Inquisition.—1. Spain believed that the religion which she had was so unquestiontably true, that any change of doctrine would be a positive dereliction of truth, a positive evil—I care not whether she was right or wrong in this belief. Spain, believed any change must be for the

worse. England, professed that she was not infallible, that she might be in error.—Upon her own principles, England could not be certain that her change was not for the worse. Spain would not be so criminal in using force as England was.—2. Spain did not ask her people to adopt a new religion, but prevented the introduction of new religions. England gave the people a new religion, and if they would not embrace it she persecuted them.—England was more criminal than Spain could have been, even if Paganism was the religion of Spain; and the pure doctrine of Christianity that which England introduced.—3. Spain kept within her own territories, England endeavored to excite civil war in the dominions of Catholic people.—4. The people of Spain, if not unanimous for retaining their old faith, and excluding novelty, were so nearly so, as to amount to moral unanimity. The people upon whom the king of England forced his new religion, were by a vast majority, in England, opposed to its reception.—And in Ireland there was a moral unanimity against it. Suppose Spain and England to be persecutors, there cannot be a question which was the more criminal.

We pass over a thousand other circumstances, and shall now give an outline of a few facts in several epochs of English domination.

"During the reign of Queen Elizabeth upwards of one hundred and twenty priests were put to death in England, besides great numbers of lay persons; but they suffered much torture of which Spain affords nothing worse.

"One of the modes of light punishment was inflicted upon Roland Jenks, a bookseller in Oxford, who, for speaking some words against the Queen's religion, was condemned at the assizes in Oxford, in 1577, to have his ears nailed to the pillory, and to deliver himself therefrom, by cutting them off with his own hands. Wood, *Hist. and Antiq. Univ. Oxa.* l. 1, page 294.

"Stow, in his *Chronicle,* informs us, 'John Nelson, for denying the Queen's supremacy, and such other traitorous words against her majesty, was drawn from Newgate to Tyburn, and there hanged, bowelled and quartered. One Sherwood, was also hanged for like treason. — February 7.' Mr. Nelson was a priest, son of Sir N. Nelson, of Shelton, near York, and was executed on February 3, 1577-8; he was cut down alive from the gibbet, and his bowels taken out, so that as the hangman had laid his hand upon the heart, and was still drawing it forth, the priest was able yet to lift himself and say in a faint voice, I forgive the Queen and all that were causers of my death, and his head was not struck off until the third blow; his quarters were hanged up on the four gates of the city, and his head placed on the bridge of London.

"Mr. Sherwood, a student, was informed against for having heard Mass in the house of the lady Tregony, a virtuous Catholic, being apprehended, touching the Queen's headship, and the Pope's supremacy. He candidly answered: that he did not believe the Queen to be the head of the Church of England, but that this pre-eminence belonged to the Pope; he was asked whether he believed the Queen to be a heretic; he answered: that he believed every person who knowingly abetted the change of religion, by which England was separated from the Catholic Church,

was a heretic. Upon which he was cast into the Tower, his lodgings robbed of about thirty pounds, which he had. He suffered the rack cruelly, in order to make him confess where Mass used to be celebrated; afterwards he was thrust into a filthy hole, where he endured much from hunger, stench, and cold, and the general want of all things, no one being permitted to afford him any comfort, so that when a Catholic gentleman, Mr. Roper, son-in-law to Sir Thomas More, had by means of another person conveyed money to his keeper for his aid, the keeper returned it through the same, alleging that the lieutenant of the Tower would not permit the alms. With much difficulty, sixpence was retained to procure him fresh straw. After six months he suffered, on Feb. 7, in the year 1577-8, at Tyburn.

"Luke Kirby, born at Richmond, in Yorkshire, was ordained priest in 1577. On the 5th of December, 1580, he was cast into the Tower of London. On the 10th of that month, he and Thomas Cottam, another priest, both suffered the torture of the engine called the scavenger's daughter. He was thrust into an iron hoop in which his body was, as it were, folded up, so that his hands, and feet, and head, were bound fast together. On the 28th of May, 1582, he was executed at Tyburn, after William Filbie, and two other priests. Kirby being made to look on whilst his companion was embowelling, and Filbie's head being cut off, was held up to him before his own lifting into the cart.

"In the year 1585, November, Hugh Taylor, priest, was apprehended, tried, and condemned at York, 'for being a priest; for having received faculties from the See of Rome, to absolve the subjects of the realm from Church censures, and reconciling them to the See of Rome, and for denying the queen's supremacy.' On the 26th of that month, he was drawn, hanged, and quartered at York.

"On the same day Marmaduke Bowes, a married gentleman of Angram Grange, near Appleton, in Cleveland, was executed for having given the said Taylor, a cup of beer, knowing him to be a priest. This Mr. Bowes, hearing of the priest's apprehension, went to York, to try and aid him by his appearance, having alighted, he went without taking off his boots or spurs, to the castle-yard to speak for the priest. He was himself questioned and immediately tried and condemned under the statute of 27 of Elizabeth, making it felony to harbour or relieve a priest, knowing him to be such, and was hanged together with Mr. Taylor, without having his boots or spurs taken off.

"Another mode of punishment, was such as was inflicted upon Mr. Wakema, a priest ordained at Douay, in 1576, as Dr. Bridgewater relates, who being sent from one of the counties to Newgate, was lodged near a most stinking hole, where the prisoners emptied themselves and their chamber-pots, and after two years suffering, died from the stench of the place.

"On the 20th of November, 1591, a new proclamation was issued against the Roman Catholics, as if all previous fines, imprisonments, tortures, rackings, worryings, banishments, hangings, bowellings, beheadings, and quarterings, had not been sufficient. Yet under this bigoted government, in the golden days of the good Queen Bess, the admiral who commanded the British fleet which attacked the Spanish Armada, was a Roman Catholic. When those Spaniards threatened invasion, the Roman Catholics, Lords and Commons, took up arms to oppose them, should they land, and when there was no more danger, the good Queen Bess, had the bodies of those Catholics swung upon gibbets, after having been plunged into poisonous dungeons, and then had those bodies, yet half living, mangled and burned, or exposed upon the gates of London, for the love of religion.

"On the 8th of the same month, the Rev. Edmund Genings, and other priests and laymen, were arrested at the house of Mr. Swithin Wells, in Gray's Inn fields, by Topliffe, the priest-catcher, who broke in the door whilst Mr. Genings was celebrating Mass. Mr. Genings was carried through the streets in his vestments; the owner of the house who was absent, was sought after and found. He and his wife, and all who were present, were cast into prison and ironed, by order of Justice Yonge, under the act which made it a felony to harbour a priest. On the 4th of December, they were brought to trial; two facts only were proved: 1. That they were found in the house of Wells, where Genings was celebrating Mass. 2. That they were aiding by praying at Mass. Genings was now dressed in a fool's coat, and the people incited to scoff him. Next day, the jury returned a verdict that Genings, Plasden, and White, were priests, and were guilty of high treason for returning to England from parts abroad, and that Wells and his wife, together with Lacy, Mason, and Hodgson, laymen, were felons for having harboured them. They were then sentenced to death, but were publicly offered their lives in court, if they would conform to the new religion, and acknowledge their most gracious Queen to be the head of God's Church in all things within the realms of England. This they refused. The woman was spared from the gallows, but died in prison; two of the priests and three of the laymen, were hanged at Tyburn. Genings and Wells were executed before the door of the house in which mass had been celebrated. The execution took place on the 10th of December. Several ministers and the priest-hunter Topliffe worried them at the gallows. Topliffe superintended the execution, and after the priest was thrown from the ladder, almost immediately he was cut down and stood upon his feet, until the hangman tripped up his heels to make him fall upon the block upon which he was to be quartered. When this butchery had been nearly finished, he once said, Oh it smarts. Mr. Wells hearing it, said, alas! sweet soul, thy pain has nearly passed, though it was great indeed, pray for me, holy saint, that mine may come. His brother mentions that hundreds who were by, testified that when his bowels were taken out, he having been ripped up and they cast into the fire; when the heart was in the hand of the hangman, who also testified it, the priest yet said, *Sancte Gregori ora pro me*: upon which the hangman said, "Zounds see his heart is in my hands, and St. Gregory in his mouth. O! the egregious Papist!!" His brother was named John Genings, and was not a Roman Catholic until a considerable time after this; but sixteen years afterwards he became a Catholic priest of the Franciscan order.

"Topliffe tortured some of those men cruelly before their execution. For instance, he had Mr. White manacled and hung up by his hands during eight hours, in the prison of Bridewell, to try and make him inform where he had said mass.

"Stow, in his *Chronicle,* 1591, says: 'The 10th of December three seminary priests, for being in this realm contrary to the statute, and four others for relieving them, were executed;' but he calls Genings ironmonger, which was a name by which he sometimes went."

Well, sirs, will it be necessary for me to horrify my readers with any further similar exhibitions? I can give a few hundreds, and all produced in its early stages by your venerable reformed Church of England, that paragon of liberality which has never existed one day dissevered from persecution of Papists. Do not, sirs, I entreat you, do not provoke me to paint those bloody scenes.

Now, sirs, I shall give you one of the facts which occurred under the mild King James I. Wisdom personified! Another Esdras!! At the commencement of his reign the priests who were in prison were allowed to sue forth their pardons by paying a small fine to the Lord Chancellor. There was one Mr. Freeman, a priest, in prison in Warwick, who could not raise the sum, and he was therefore drawn, hanged and quartered, so that when the king was told it, he exclaimed, "Alas! poor man, had he not four nobles to purchase his pardon?" But on the 22d of February, 1603-4, a proclamation issued to enforce the law against all who should remain in England, after March 19. Then began the butchery again. Next began the persecution by pretended plots. Cecil's holiday was made, and the Church of England prayed against gunpowder. Guy Fawkes then, and Thistlewood lately, were allured by those who wished to make a foundation for severities, and to justify what was unjustifiable. Titus Oates, and the contrivers of the Rye-house plot, and of the mealtub plot, were all but puppets played against the Papists. The British Parliament is, though slowly, proving the atrocious criminality of the persecutors in whose path it follows. I shall give you only the single instance of one illustrious victim of plots, and he suffered under Charles II. whose father, as well as Oliver Cromwell, continued the butcheries.

Dr. Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh, Primate of Ireland.—1681.[70]

"This apostolic man was descended of an illustrious family in the kingdom of Ireland. He was educated in the Catholic religion; and finding himself called to the ecclesiastical state, went abroad into Italy, and there spent almost twenty years at Rome, partly in studying and partly in teaching divinity, where also he received the degree of doctor in that faculty: and having acquired a general esteem by his virtue and learning, the See of Armagh falling vacant, he was chosen and consecrated to it about the year 1669, and sent over to Ireland to govern the flock committed to his charge, which he did in such a manner, as to give great edification to the Catholics, and to be much esteemed by the very Protestants; in proof of which we shall here put down what some Protestant historians have written of him, upon occasion of his trial and condemnation.

"And first Dr. Burnet, who was never suspected of telling a lie in favour of a Papist, in his history of his own time, p. 202, acquaints us, from the testimony of the Earl of Essex, that Plunket was a wise and sober man, who was for living quietly and in due submission to the government, without engaging in intrigues of state; and that he was condemned only upon the testimony of some lewd priest, whom he had censured, and other evidence; brutal, profligate men, who found how good a trade swearing was in England, and thereupon came over and gave evidence of a plot also in Ireland. With Dr. Burnet Mr. Eachard also agrees in his *History*

[70] From his printed trial and speech, Father Corker's *Letters*, and the historians of those times.

of England, 3d vol. p. 631, where he tells us, that Mr. Plunket had an attestation of his good behaviour in Ireland, under the hands of the Earl of Essex and the Lord Berkley, when they were lords lieutenants of that kingdom. That the accusation against him looked very romantic, not to say malicious; yet the witnesses were so perfect and positive in their oaths, that the jury found him guilty of high treason, and sentence passed upon him accordingly. 'That he has been assured by an unquestionable hand, that the Earl of Essex himself was so sensible of this poor man's hardships, that he generously applied to the king for a pardon, and told his majesty the witnesses must needs be perjured, for these things sworn against him could not possibly be true. Upon which, the king in a passion said, why did you not attest this at his trial? It would have done him good then. I dare not pardon any one. And so concluded with the same kind of answer he had given another person formerly; his blood be upon your head, and not upon mine.'

"But the continuator of Baker's *Chronicle* is still more particular in his account of this Catholic prelate, p. 710. 'In the mean time, says he, came on the trial of Dr. Oliver Plunket, a Popish titular Archbishop of Armagh, who called himself primate of all Ireland. He was a worthy and good man, who, notwithstanding the high title given him, was in a very mean state of life, as having nothing to subsist on but the contributions of a few poor clergy of his own religion in the province of Ulster, who, having but little themselves, could not spare much to him. In these low circumstances he lived, though meanly, quietly and contentedly, meddling with nothing but the concerns of his function, and dissuading all about him from entering into any turbulent or factious intrigues. But while the Popish plot was warm, some lewd Irish priests, and others of that nation, hearing that England was disposed to hearken to good swearers, thought themselves qualified for the employment. So they came over with an account of a plot in Ireland, and were all received by Lord Shaftsbury. They were also examined by the Parliament, and what they said was believed. They were very profligate wretches, and some of the priests among them had been censured by Plunket for their lewdness; so, partly out of revenge, and partly to keep themselves in business, they charged a plot upon that innocent, quiet man; so that he was sent for over and brought to trial. The evidences swore, that, upon his being made primate of Ireland, he engaged to raise sixty or seventy thousand Irish, to be ready to join with the French to destroy the Protestant religion, and to get Dublin, Londonderry, and all the sea-ports into their hands; and that, besides the French army, there was a Spanish army to join with them, and that the Irish clergy were to contribute to this design. Plunket, in his defence, alleged the improbability of all that was sworn against him; which was apparent enough. He alleged that the Irish clergy were so poor, that he himself, who was the head of a whole province, lived in a little thatched house with only one servant, having never above sixty pounds a year income; so that neither he nor they could be thought very likely to carry on a design of this nature. But the fact being positively sworn against him, and the jury unacquainted with the witnesses' characters, and the scene of action, he was brought in guilty and condemned. It is said that the Earl of Essex was as sensible of the injustice done him,' and so forth, as above. So far this Protestant historian.

"But now let us hear what a Catholic, and one who was intimately acquainted with him in the last scene of his life, viz., the learned and truly religious father,

J. Corker, writes of him in a letter penned after his death. 'I cannot as yet,' says he, 'pretend to give you (as you desire) a description of the virtues of the glorious archbishop and martyr, Dr. Oliver Plunket. I am promised the particulars of his life and actions, both at Rome, where he studied and taught almost twenty years, and in Ireland, where he exercised his episcopal, or rather apostolical function, till he became a champion of faith: but these particulars are not, as yet, arrived at my hands. After his transportation hither, he was, you know, close confined, and secluded from all conversation, save that of his keepers, until his arraignment: so that here, also, I am much in the dark, and can only inform you of what I learned, as it were by chance, from the mouths of the said keepers, viz., that he spent his time in almost continual prayer; that he fasted usually three or four days a week, with nothing but bread; that he appeared to them always modestly cheerful, without any anguish or concern at his danger, or streight confinement; that by his sweet and pious demeanour, he attracted an esteem and reverence from those few who came near him. When he was arraigned, it is true, I could write to him, and he to me; but our letters were read, transcribed, and examined by the officers, before they were delivered to either of us; for which cause we had little other communication than what was necessary in order to his trial. But the trial being ended, and he condemned, his man had leave to wait on him alone in his chamber, by whose means we had free intercourse by letters to each other. And now it was I clearly perceived the spirit of God in him, and those lovely fruits of the Holy Ghost, charity, joy, peace, and so forth, transparent in his soul. And not only I, but many other Catholics, who came to receive his benediction, and were eye-witnesses, (a favour not denied to us,) can testify, there appeared in his words, in his actions, in his countenance, something so divinely elevated, such a composed mixture of cheerfulness, constancy, love, sweetness, and candour, as manifestly denoted the divine goodness had made him fit for a victim, and destined him for heaven. None saw or came near him, but received new comfort, new fervour, new desires to please, serve, and suffer for Christ Jesus, by his very presence. Concerning the manner and state of his prayer, he seemed most devoted to Catholic sentences taken out of Scripture, the divine office and missal, which he made me procure for him three months before he died: upon these sentences he let his soul dilate itself in love, following herein the sweet impulse and dictates of the Holy Ghost, and reading his prayers writ rather in his heart, than in his book, according to that — *unctio ejus docet vos de omnibus, (St. John* ii, 27). For this reason I suppose it was, that when with great humility he sent me his last speech to correct, he also writ me word, he would not at the place of execution make use of any other set form or method of prayer, than the *Pater noster, Ave Maria, Credo, Miserere, In manus tuas Domine,* and so forth, and for the rest, he would breathe forth his soul in such prayers and ejaculations as God Almighty should then inspire him withal. He continually endeavoured to improve and advance himself in the purity of divine love, and by consequence also in contrition for his sins past, of his deficiency in both which this humble soul complained to me as the only thing that troubled him. This love had extinguished in him all fear of death, *perfecta charitas, foris mittit timorem.* A lover feareth not, but rejoiceth at the approach of the beloved. Hence the joy of our holy martyr seemed still to increase with his danger, and was fully accomplished by an assurance of death. The very night before he died, being now, as it were, at heart's ease, he went to bed at eleven o'clock, and slept quietly and soundly till four in the morning, at which time his man, who lay in the room with him, awaked him; so

little concern had he upon his spirit, or rather so much had the loveliness of the end beautified the horror of the passage to it. After he certainly knew that God Almighty had chosen him to the crown and dignity of martyrdom, he continually studied how to divest himself of himself, and become more and more an entire, pleasing and perfect holocaust: to which end, as he gave up his soul with all its faculties to the conduct of God, so, for God's sake, he resigned the care and disposal of his body to unworthy me, and so forth. But I neither can nor dare undertake to describe unto you, the signal virtues of this blessed martyr. There appeared in him something beyond expression, — something more than human: the most savage and hard-hearted people were mollified and attendred at his sight; many Protestants in my hearing wished their souls in the same state with his; all believed him innocent, and he made Catholics, even the most timorous, in love with death. When he was carried out of the pressyard to execution, he turned him about to our chamber windows, and with a pleasant aspect and elevated hands gave us his benediction. How he composed himself after he was taken from hence, you yourself can give a more exact account than I, and so forth.' So far, Father Corker, to whom the holy prelate applied himself for the affairs of his conscience whilst he was preparing for his exit, and who was consequently the best acquainted with his interior.

"Archbishop Plunket was arraigned at the King's Bench bar, May the 3d, 1681, but not brought to his trial till the 8th of June He had been then a year and a half in prison: he was found guilty by the jury, upon the testimony of those perjured wretches that appeared against him: when he heard the verdict, he cried out *Deo Gratias,* God be thanked. The lord chief justice, before he pronounced sentence, wished him to renounce his false religion, as he called it, against which he most bitterly inveighed, as ten times worse than paganism: but the prisoner knew better what his religion was than the judge, and gave his lordship to understand that he was not disposed to alter it upon any conditions. He added, 'If I were a man that had no care of my conscience, I might have saved my life; for I was offered it by divers people here, if I would but confess my own guilt and accuse others: but, my lord, I had rather die ten thousand deaths than wrongfully accuse anybody. And the time will come when your lordship will see what these witnesses are, that have come in against me. I do assure your lordship, if I were a man that had not good principles, I might easily have saved my own life; but I had rather die ten thousand deaths, than wrongfully to take away one farthing of any man's goods, one day of his liberty, or one minute of his life.' After he had said this, sentence was pronounced against him in the usual form, on the 15th of June. After condemnation, he writ the following letter to Father Corker:

"'*Dear Sir*: —

"'I am obliged to you for the favour and charity of the 20th, and for all your former benevolences: and whereas I cannot in this country remunerate you, with God's grace I hope to be grateful in that kingdom, which is properly our country. And truly God gave me (though unworthy of it) that grace to have *fortem animum mortis terrore carentem,* "a courage fearless of death." I have many sins to answer for before the supreme Judge of the high bench, where no false witnesses can have audience. But as for the bench yesterday, I am not guilty of any crime there objected to me: I would I could be so clear at the bench of the All-powerful. *Ut ut sit,* there is one comfort, that he cannot be deceived, because he is omniscious, and knows all secrets, even of hearts; and cannot deceive because all goodness; so that I may be sure of a fair trial, and will get time sufficient to call witnesses; nay,

the Judge will bring them in a moment, if there will be need of any. You and your comrade's prayers will be powerful advocates of that bench. Here none are admitted for

" 'Your affectionate friend,

" '*Oliver Plunkett.*'

"On the first day of July, 1681, he was drawn from Newgate to Tyburn: on which occasion the serenity of his countenance, the courage, cheerfulness, and piety with which he went to meet death, gave great edification to the spectators. At the place of execution he spoke as follows:

" 'I have some few days past abided my trial at the King's Bench, and now very soon I must hold up my hand at the King of Kings' Bench, and appear before a Judge, who cannot be deceived by false witnesses, nor corrupted allegations, for he knoweth the secrets of hearts. Neither can he deceive any, or give an unjust sentence, or be misled by respects of persons. He being all goodness and a most just Judge, will infallibly decree an eternal reward for all good works, and condign punishment for the smallest transgressions against his commandments; which being a most certain and undoubted truth, it would be a wicked act, and contrary to my perpetual welfare, that I should now by declaring anything contrary to truth, commit a detestable sin, for which within a very short time I must receive sentence of everlasting damnation; after which, there is no reprieve or hope of pardon. I will therefore confess the truth, without any equivocation, and make use of the words according to their accustomed signification; assuring you, moreover, that I am of that certain persuasion, that no power, not only upon earth, but also in heaven, can dispense with me, or give me leave to make a false protestation: and I protest, upon the word of a dying man, and as I hope for salvation at the hands of the supreme Judge, that I will declare the naked truth with all candour and sincerity, and that my affairs may be better known to all the world.

" ' 'Tis to be observed, that I have been accused in Ireland of treason and *praemunire,* and that there I was arraigned and brought to my trial; but the prosecutors, (men of flagitious and infamous lives), perceiving that I had records and witnesses, who would evidently convince them, and clearly show my innocency and their wickedness, they voluntarily absented themselves, and came to this city to procure that I should be brought hither to my trial, (where the crimes objected were not committed,) where the jury did not know me, or the qualities of my accusers, and were not informed of several other circumstances conducing to a fair trial. Here, after six months' close imprisonment, or thereabouts, I was brought to the bar on the 3d of May, and arraigned for a crime, for which I was before arraigned in Ireland — a strange resolution, a rare fact, of which you will hardly find a precedent these five hundred years past: but whereas my witnesses and records were in Ireland, the lord chief justice gave me five weeks' time to get them brought hither: but by reason of the uncertainty of the seas, of wind and weather, and of the difficulty of getting copies of records, and bringing many witnesses from several counties in Ireland, for many other impediments (of which affidavit was made) I could not at the end of five weeks get the records and witnesses brought hither; I therefore begged for twelve days more, that I might be in readiness for my trial, which the lord chief justice denied; and so I was brought to my trial, and exposed, as it were with my hands tied, to these merciless perjurers, and so forth.'

"Then having numbered up the heads of the accusation against him, and refuted them by the most solemn protestations of his innocency, and by showing not only

the improbability, but even the impossibility of his being guilty of what was laid to his charge, he goes on.

"'You see, therefore, what condition I am in, and you have heard what protestations I have made of innocency, and I hope you will believe the words of a dying man. And that you may be the more induced to give me credit, I assure you that a great peer sent me notice, that he would save my life, if I would accuse others; but I answered, that I never knew of any conspirators in Ireland, but such as were publicly known outlaws, and that to save my life, I would not falsely accuse any, nor prejudice my own soul. *Quid prodest homini,* and so forth. To take away any man's life or goods wrongfully, ill becometh any Christian, especially a man of my calling, being a clergyman of the Catholic Church, and also an unworthy prelate, which I do openly confess; neither will I deny to have exercised in Ireland the functions of a Catholic prelate, as long as there was any connivance or toleration; and by preaching, and teaching, and statutes, to have endeavoured to bring the clergy (of which I had a care) to a due comportment according to their calling; and though thereby I did but my duty, yet some, who would not amend, had a prejudice for me, and especially my accusers, to whom I did endeavour to do good; I mean the clergymen. (As for the four laymen who appeared against me, I was never acquainted with them.) But you see how I am rewarded, and how by false oaths they have brought me to this untimely death; which wicked act being a defect of persons, ought not to reflect upon the order of St. Francis, or upon the Roman Catholic clergy, it being well known that there was a Judas amongst the twelve Apostles, and a wicked man, called Nicholas, amongst the seven deacons; and even as one of the said deacons, viz., holy Stephen, did pray for those who stoned him to death, so do I for those who with perjuries spill my innocent blood, saying, as St. Stephen did, O Lord, lay not this sin to them. I do heartily forgive them, and also the judges, who (by denying me sufficient time to bring my records and witnesses from Ireland,) did expose my life to evident danger. I do also forgive all those who had a hand in bringing me from Ireland to be tried here, where it was morally impossible for me to have a fair trial. I do finally forgive all who did concur directly or indirectly to take away my life; and I ask forgiveness of all those whom I ever offended by thought, word, or deed. I beseech the All-powerful, that his divine majesty grant our king, queen, the duke of York, and all the royal family, health, long life, and all prosperity in this world, and in the next everlasting felicity.

"'Now that I have showed sufficiently (as I think) how innocent I am of any plot or conspiracy, I would I were able, with the like truth, to clear myself of high crimes committed against the Divine Majesty's commandments, (often transgressed by me,) for which I am sorry with all my heart, and if I should or could live a thousand years, I have a firm resolution and a strong purpose, by your grace, O my God, never to offend you; and I beseech your Divine Majesty, by the merits of Christ, and by the intercession of his blessed mother, and all the blessed angels and saints, to forgive me my sins, and to grant my soul eternal rest.'

"After he had ended his speech, he recited the psalm *Miserere mei Deus,* and other devout aspirations; and his cap being drawn over his eyes, he continued recommending his happy soul into the hands of his Saviour till the cart was drawn away. He was suffered to hang till he expired, and then was cut down, and bowelled: his heart and bowels were thrown into the fire: his body was begged of the king, and was interred (all but the head and arms to the elbows, which were

disposed of elsewhere) in the churchyard of St. Giles in the fields, with a copper plate on his breast, with the following inscription:

"In this tomb resteth the body of the Right Rev. Oliver Plunkett, archbishop of Armagh, and primate of Ireland, who in hatred of religion, was accused of high treason by false witnesses, and for the same condemned and executed at Tyburn, his heart and bowels being taken out, and cast into the fire. He suffered martyrdom with constancy, the first of July, 1681, in the reign of King Charles the Second.

"Four years after his body was taken up, and found entire. It was sent abroad, to Lambspring, where Abbot Corker, 1693, erected over it a handsome monument, with this Latin inscription:

"*Reliquae sanctae memoriae Oliveri Plunket, archiepiscopi Armachani, Hiberniae primatis, qui in odium Catholicae fidei laqueo suspensus, extractis visceribus et in ignem projectis, celebris martyr occubuit Londini, primo die Julij (stylo veteri) anno salutis* 1681."

Here, sirs, is a specimen of the mode in which the Irish Catholic hierarchy was generally disposed of. Whenever a bishop was discovered to be in the country, he was either put to death or banished, yet, through the mercy of God they preserved their unbroken succession. Edmund Burke said of the code of laws which the British Protestants made against the Irish Catholics:

"When those laws were not bloody, they were worse. They were slow, cruel, outrageous in their nature, and kept men alive only to insult in their persons every one of the rights and feelings of humanity."

The description given of them by Mr. Carey, who has lately published a sketch of the code, is in the following words:

"But the case of Ireland is probably among the most forcible illustrations of this maxim that history affords. A herd of wretched oligarchs has for centuries existed there, who have bartered their country's dearest rights and interests, for the privilege of trampling down their countrymen, over whom they have exercised the most galling tyranny that the mind of man can conceive.

"This oligarchy, 'The Protestant ascendency,' is composed of the professors of the established religion. Its oppression has always extended over the Protestant dissenters, as well as over the Roman Catholics; but with very great disparity of effect. The principal grievance of the Protestant dissenter, which he bears in common with the Catholic is, that he is obliged to support the ministers of two different religions, his own and the dominant one. In other respects he stands on nearly the same ground as the professor of the established religion.

"The tyranny exercised by this oligarchy over the Catholics, has displayed itself in the form of a barbarous code of laws, the professed object of which was 'to prevent the growth of Popery;' but the real one, to plunder those on whom they were to operate, of their property, and to divest them of their most sacred rights and privileges; and the direct effect of which has been to demoralize the nation; to reduce it to a state of the most deplorable wretchedness and misery not exceeded throughout the wide world; and to legalize an odious system of rapine and fraud.

"Just Alla! what must be thy look,
When such a wretch before thee stands,
Unblushing, with thy Sacred Book,

Turning the leaves with blood-stained hands,
And wresting from its page sublime
His creed of lust, and hate, and crime!
Ev'n as those bees of Trebizond,
Which, from the sunniest flowers that glad,
With their pure smile, the garden round,
Draw venom forth, that drives men mad!

"This odious and oppressive system was above half a century in maturing. Hardly a session of the Irish Parliament took place in which there was not devised some new penalty, some new forfeiture, or some new disqualification, to crush, to prey on, and to immolate the wretched Roman Catholics. The utmost ingenuity of fraud and rapine was constantly tortured, to add to the weight of their clanking chains.

"The intrinsic wickedness of this code would be sufficient to entitle its authors to be recorded in the annals of infamy, as long as time shall endure. But its turpitude is greatly enhanced by the consideration that it was a flagrant and perfidious violation, not merely of the spirit, but of the letter of the articles for the surrender of Limerick, by which the Roman Catholics were to be secured in all the privileges they enjoyed in the reign of Charles II. Still further to aggravate its baseness, if aggravation were possible, the government was not only thus pledged sacredly to secure them whatever they had enjoyed, but the king and queen bound themselves in the most solemn manner, to 'endeavour to procure them such further security as might preserve them from any disturbance upon the account of their religion.' Far from procuring 'further security,' the few barriers that existed to 'secure them from disturbance,' were prostrated, and they were exposed, defenceless, to the mercy of the worst of their fellow-subjects, by whom they were, for sixty or seventy years, outraged, oppressed, and most piratically plundered of their estates by all the chicane and fraud to which this detestable code held out so powerful an invitation."

The following enumeration is a very imperfect outline of part of this code:

"All Roman Catholic archbishops, bishops, vicars-general, deans, or any other persons of that religion, exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were liable to imprisonment and transportation; and, in case of returning, were guilty of high treason, and were to be punished accordingly.

"In the year 1704, a law was passed, ordering all the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland to register themselves in the parishes to which they respectively belonged; and to give security for their good behaviour, and for their non-removal from the county where they then resided.

"When a priest officiated in any other parish than the one wherein he was registered, he was liable to transportation; and in case of return, to be hanged without benefit of clergy.

"Every Roman Catholic clergyman in the kingdom, not registered; every one afterwards coming into it from abroad; every one who kept a curate or assistant; and every such curate or assistant, was also liable to transportation, and eventually to the gallows, if he returned.

"Two justices might summon any Roman Catholic, sixteen years old, to appear before them, to give testimony when or where he heard mass, who were present, and who celebrated it; and all such other matter and things, touching the priest,

as might be necessary to his conviction. In case of refusal, he was subject to a fine of twenty pounds, or imprisonment for one year.

"Any Roman Catholic priest, celebrating marriage between two Protestants, or between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic, was guilty of felony, and liable to suffer death without benefit of clergy!

"No Roman Catholic was allowed to have in his own possession, or the possession of any other person, for his use, any horse, mare or gelding, of the value of five pounds. Any Protestant, discovering to any two justices that a Roman Catholic had a horse of that value, might, with a constable and assistant, break open any door; seize such horse, bring him before the justices, and, on paying five pounds five shillings, have the property of such horse, "as if bought in market overt! ! !'

"A person concealing such horse was liable to be imprisoned three months, and pay treble the value.

"Civil officers were authorized to seize the horses of Roman Catholics, on certain contingencies. If returned, the owners were to pay the expenses of seizing and keeping them.

"To increase the profligacy and turpitude of this code, a large portion of its provisions were *ex post facto*, and operated the work of rapine and depredation for years antecedent to their enaction. In 1710 an act was passed, annulling fines, recoveries, and settlements, made for seven years preceding.

"All collateral, and other securities, by mortgages, judgments, statutes merchant, or of the staple, or otherwise howsoever, to cover, support, or make good any bargain, sale, confirmation, release, or other conveyance, contrary to a preceding piratical law, were rendered null and void. And any Protestant might sue out such mortgages, or sue for such lands, in any court of law, and obtain a verdict, and have execution to be put in possession thereof."

Nor was this code inoperative—many a time have I beheld the lands which it wrenched from my progenitors. I have often heard several near relatives complain of the manner in which, during their youth, they were persecuted into learning a catechism which vilified the doctrine of the Christian world, and outraged every feeling of charity, and when they were grown up they were exposed to the punishment of felons for endeavouring to teach their children how to read without at the same time teaching them to hate their parents, and to despise their religion.

Sirs, I am sick of this topic—every feeling which human nature possesses was tortured.

A young lady in Dublin, who could not betray her conscience, fled from her persecutors rather than desert the Roman Catholic religion. She was amiable and respectably connected. An eminent shop-keeper in Dublin who was a Roman Catholic, gave her an asylum in his family; the consequence was, his persecution. When in 1759, the Catholics made some little exertion to have part of their load removed, the venerable descendant of the last Irish monarch, wrote to the shop-keeper to co-operate with his fellow-Catholics. Read the answer given to that invitation:

Letter of Mr. Saul, to Mr. O'Connor of Belanagare.

Nov. 15, 1759.

"*My dear Mr. O'Connor*: — I am an utter stranger to what our people here are doing, and I am resolved never to be concerned in any affairs during my life, but those of my family and a small circle of friends; what I suffered on account of my humanity in the case of Miss Toole, has taught me this lesson; I was then made to understand, from the mouth of no less a personage than the Lord Chancellor, that the laws did not presume a Papist to exist here, nor could they breathe without the connivance of government. If so, for I shall not attempt to think otherwise, after so solemn a declaration, how can you blame me for being an enemy to addresses and to memoirs? even you cannot persuade me that they tend to any purpose. I remember to have read in some of the Classic books (when a schoolboy), a line or two, which have been of singular use to me in the course of my life.

"*Nunquam poenituit tacuisse, at soepe locutum.* And now, my dear friend, since there is not the least prospect of such a relaxation of the penal laws, as would induce one Roman Catholic to tarry in this house of bondage, who can purchase a settlement in some other land, where freedom, and security of property can be obtained, will you condemn me for saying, that if I cannot be one of the first, I will not be one of the last, to take flight from a country, where I have not the least expectation of encouragement to enable me to carry on my manufactures, to any considerable extent.

"*Heu: fuge crudeles terras, fuge littus avarum.* The Parliament of 59, is not the Parliament of 53; the heart was then on the right side of the political body, ready to promote on all occasions the interest and welfare of the country; but the case is quite the reverse at present; the Patriots of that happy era are the betrayers of this; and he only is wrong, who stands out for too great a price, or did not sell himself in time for what he could obtain. If (as Pope says) 'whatever is, is right;' those trials may perhaps be intended for our greater benefit, as lessons to show us, that our kingdom is not of this world, that we are not to expect any real happiness in this life, and that the greatest calamities and miseries here must have an end.

"This reflection, I own, has often relieved me on many distressing occurrences, but how I will be able to bear at this time of life, when nature is far advanced in its decline, and my constitution by constant exercise of mind very much impaired, the fatal necessity of quitting for ever, friends, relations, and ancient patrimony, my *natale solum*, to retire perhaps to some dreary inauspicious clime, there to play the schoolboy again, to learn the language, laws, and constitution of the country; to make new friends and acquaintances; in short, to begin the world anew; how this separation, I say, from everything dear in this sublunary world would affect me, I cannot say, but with an agitated and throbbing heart.

"But when religion dictates, and prudence points out the only way to preserve posterity from temptation and perdition, I feel this consideration predominating over all others; I am resolved as soon as possible to sell out, and to expatriate; and I must content myself with the melancholy satisfaction of treasuring up in my memory the kindnesses and affections of my friends, living or dying.

"I am, my dear O'Connor, ever yours, and so forth.

Lawrence Saul."

Is this spirit of persecution now dormant? Read the votes of the

Bishops in the House of Lords—read Archbishop Magee's manifestos against the Roman Catholics—read the following extracts from the speech of Mr. Richard Shiel, at the last aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. There are several thousand of places of profit and honour, of political influence and of distinction, which no talent can reach, no industry can acquire, but at the expense of an atrocious perjury, viz., that the Roman Catholics are idolaters. The perjury commences with the head of the English Protestant Church, and infects his chancellor, his judges, his privy council, his peers, his commons, his sheriffs, his mayors, his bailiffs, every corporation officer, and it is devoutly gone through by every person in the church, from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the sexton, and lately a grave-digger lost his place upon its being unluckily discovered that his wife was an abominable papist! I have, sirs, asked some of the most upright and honourable members of the British Parliament: "Do you believe that Roman Catholics are idolaters." They were shocked at the question. They at once answered: "Certainly, no." I asked, "Why then do you swear it?" Mark the reply. "Every one knows that we do not believe the allegations of the oath. We know the assertion is a falsehood; but we swear it for form's sake, and to prove that we are Protestants." Is this no persecution? We are told, "you cannot be trusted on your oath, because the Pope can dispense with you for perjury, but we can depend upon ourselves who swear what we no not believe to be true, in order to monopolize the good things which we keep from you, as you will not swear as we do." This is the manner in which the Church of England folk have devised an honest kind of plundering and speculating system! See the use they make of their power:

"Mr. Sheil seconded the resolution proposed by Mr. Bellew, and said: A few years ago, a transport, with a number of soldiers on board, was driven by a violent storm upon the coast of Waterford. The people, as is unfortunately usual, assembled rather for the purpose of depredation than of assistance. There was one individual among the crowd, who exhibited an honourable contrast, to his habitual indifference, and evinced an intrepidity which amounted to patriotism in his efforts to save his fellow-men. He rushed into the waves, threw himself among the breakers, snatched a drowning soldier with one arm, and with the other made his way to the shore. Nor was his courageous humanity limited to a single achievement. Again and again he precipitated himself into the sea, until he had saved six human beings, and his exertions did not cease till the ship went to pieces. This singular example of noble daring was narrated to a gentleman who had a mind capable of appreciating its high moral value. The late Mr. M'Dougall, who mentioned the fact I am about to relate, was deeply struck with the intrepidity of this humble hero, and, after remunerating him as far as his individual means would allow, he determined to make an application to Government on his behalf. It was, sir, under the administration of the gentleman whose name has been engrafted upon the English language, and

gaining an equivocal perpetuity, has furnished the etymology of a familiar and permanent designation of the police. Mr. M'Dougall had no other passport to the Castle, but the cause of humanity which he went to advocate. He was not introduced to the great man, but presented to one of the external minions of the ante-chamber, to whom he communicated the details of this noble action. The gentleman, with the usual nonchalance of office, stated that it should be conveyed to Mr. Peel, and retired into the penetralia of authority. After an interval of some time, he returned and said, 'Mr. Peel presents his compliments to Mr. M'Dougall, and begs to know to what class the person in question belongs?' 'He is,' said Mr. M'Dougall, 'a poor fisherman upon the coast, and supports a large family by his laborious peril.' 'That,' said the gentleman of the ante-chamber, 'is not exactly what Mr. Secretary Peel means to inquire — you must understand me. To what particular class does he belong? I perceive that you do not yet apprehend me. To what particular — or, in a word, is he a Protestant?' You start, and no wonder you are astonished at this heart-chilling interrogatory — and yet, this is the fatal and disastrous question with which you, and I, and every one of us are encountered in every department of society — from the first to the last, from the fisherman to the peer — we are all swept into this comprehensive interrogation. Is he a Protestant? is the question put at the bar, in the field, and on the quarter-deck; it is bellowed in the corporation — it is muttered in the four courts — it is lisped in the drawing-room, and it is whispered in the Castle, 'Is he a Protestant? is he one of us?' 'Is he,' as Mr. Saurin has it, 'of the right sort?' And is not the question a disastrous one? Does it not afford a solution of all the calamities of Ireland? Does it not elucidate the miseries of Ireland? What was the question in Venice — 'Is he a patrician?' What was the question in Spain, in reference to the Moors — 'Is he a Catholic?' What was the question in feudal Germany — 'Is he a nobleman?' What is the question in South America — 'Is he a Spaniard?' What is the question in modern Greece — 'Is he a Turk?' And what is the question in unfortunate Ireland — 'Is he a Protestant?' And that question is more loaded with animosity than all the rest, because to the taunt of distinction it superadds the virulence of sectarian hate. 'The worst of all aristocracies exists in Ireland,' says Adam Smith, 'the aristocracy of religion.' I can brook the inferiority of birth; I am reconciled to the ascendency of wealth — a lofty nobleman, a purse-proud merchant I can endure — but I cannot digest the aristocracy of the Charter school, and the authoritativeness of the Blue Coat Hospital! (reiterated cheers.) A Lord is bearable — a portentous burger may be endured — but there is something intolerable in the bloated ascendancy of the aldermanic paunch, (loud laughter.) Edmund Burke used to say, a Protestant footman is nobler than a Popish peer. And he was right; for the insignias of his title, mock his degradation. What is the result of this unnatural system? — wealth is robbed of its influence — rank of its authority — and genius of its honours. And upon what principle is such a system supported? It is said that it is required by the Constitution; strange Constitution which requires the degradation of a whole people for the enjoyment of its advantages. If it were so, and in place of being the depository of freedom, it would be the asylum of intolerance. From France, from Prussia, from Holland, from Hungary, bigotry has been driven, and finds a refuge in the boasted institutions of Great Britain. It is in the fane of British freedom that she has preserved her last altar, and there she receives the rights of seven millions as an oblation. She has ten thousand parsons for her worshippers, and she has Eldon for her high priest. He shares in the incense which he offers

up — he wields a golden censer, and with dilated nostrils, snuffs in the fat fumes of the sacrifice. He is of all the advocates of domination, the steadiest foe to freedom, and the staunchest antagonist of political justice. But let him pass. Thank God, that for the sake of truth and Ireland, he is not immortal; and what philosophy cannot do, may be achieved by the gout and rheum. The people of England must begin to feel that seven millions of citizens ought to be enfranchised. Their helots are too numerous, too intelligent, too rich, too active, and too high-minded. We have too much money, too much education, too much union, and too much of the unconquerable love of liberty amongst us. And to what end is this system supported? Is it for the sake of 'that Castle of indolence,' the Church? (loud applause.) That the Church cannot be endangered by emancipation, is certain, but if it were, which is better, that the parson should be fat, or that the people should be free? (loud applause.) Of what use is the enormous establishment of Ireland, of which the heirarchical abdomen is at once the prototype and the result? Mr. Plunkett has defended it *ex-officio*. I don't much blame him for it—he is member for the college and Attorney-General. He ought to begin thus, 'Mr. Speaker, in this case I am counsel against Mr. Hume, and I hold a brief for the church, with a fee of £8000 a year.' Greatly as I admire and esteem Mr. Plunkett, I must be permitted, while I make every allowance for him, to dissent from his arguments. I would put this case to him: 'Suppose, Mr. Attorney, that you were told that in one of the islands of Japan, there were two thousand Boures, who professed a religion different from seven millions of the people, and who, for occasionally attending in their desolate and cobwebbed pagodas, were invested of one-tenth of the island, and two millions of acres — what would you say? Why, you would laugh, to be sure, though the Japanese might have cause to weep. We are told by the Attorney-General, that it is of use that there should be a couple of thousand sinecurists in Ireland. What would Mr. Plunkett think, if there were a couple of thousand innkeepers, with magnificent accommodations, sustained at the public expense, upon a road which nobody travelled? (great applause.) The parsons keep their resting-places upon a new route to heaven, to which we happen to prefer the old-established highway. Accordingly there is little or no resort at their places of spiritual refreshment. But we are told that their learning is of eminent utility — where are the evidences of it? There are one or two, indeed, who are distinguished for literature — some of the bishops deserve high praise. Magee is a man of great talents, and Mant has learning.

> " 'Even in a bishop I can spy desert,
> Cashel is decent, and Limerick has a heart.'

"But compare the Irish Church with any other in the world, and how must it fall in our estimation? Look to the University of Dublin — where are their works of literature, of science, or even of divinity? The utmost effort of their genius, is the production of an occasional commentary for the use of schools. They do not produce the one-twentieth as much as the pauper University of Glasgow. And does this barrenness arise from want of talent? Impossible. It arises from their inglorious opulence, which extinguishes literary ambition, and puts out the intellectual fire. But it is alleged, that if the wealth of the church were reduced, it would be claimed by the priests — most ingenious suppositions! Our clergy, so far from expressing a wish for an opulent establishment, prefer their honourable and Christian dependence upon the generosity, or rather the gratitude of the people, whose contributions are the tribute of their hearts. I trust they will long remain in their

virtuous mediocrity, above the exigencies of distress, and below the corruptions of opulence. How honourable is the contrast which they exhibit, with the clergy of the established religion! Where is the parson to be found? At the great man's levee, at the bishop's banquet, and at the damsel's toilette. You find him offering his polished adulation to the owner of an advowson, or breathing his inspirations

'In the soft labyrinth of a lady's ear.'

Where will you find the priest? You will find him journeying amidst the tempest, in the lonely mountain and the desolate moor — you will find him stretched beside the bed of straw, inhaling pestilence and death — breathing consolation into agony, and life into despair — softening by his precepts, and alluring by his example — and realizing Goldsmith's paternal panegyric —

"And as a bird, each fond endearment tries,
To lure its new fledged offspring to the skies;
He tried each art, reproved each dull delay,
Allured to brighter worlds and led the way.'"

Well, sirs, have we had enough on persecution? You observe, I did not touch on the persecutions of Catholics in America by your church. I have been quite sparing, but I advise you not to provoke me;—America furnishes me with more than the Inquisition could give you. You shall have it if you will,—but I shall be sorry to be forced to give it. Be cautious, I advise you. Do not, in future, hazard assertions without previous examination. The English Protestant Church has been guilty of more persecution of Roman Catholics, than would counterbalance the crimes of all the persecutors who have had power in the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholics were the first who introduced the principles of religious liberty in America; they were the first who established those principles by law; and, in America, they have been the greatest sufferers, and almost the only sufferers, for the sake of conscience. And at this day, two of the states, viz., New Jersey and North Carolina, violate the principles of liberty in their attempt to degrade them;[71] and you and hundreds of others who are equally bereft of charity, truth, and information, are persecutors by your revilings and your calumny.

I am, sirs, devotedly yours,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,
A native of Ireland.

[71] The constitutions of both states have since been amended.

LETTER XIII.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Mar. 1, 1825.

To the Rev. William Hawley and his Associates, Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Sirs:—I come now to the last topic upon which I shall have to trouble the readers of the *Miscellany* respecting your offensive publication.

You assert that every consistent Catholic must feel that the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve in Paris was in accordance with the tenets of that church to which I have the happiness to belong. Also, that the revocation of the edict of Nantz was consistent therewith. I before showed, that the massacre was in direct violation of our principles. I come now to examine the fact. Was this massacre a butchery on the score of religion? No. Was it commanded by the church? No. Was there any connexion between the perpetrators and the church, save that unfortunately they were members of that church? None whatever.

Sirs, every person who is in the least degree conversant with the history of France, knows that it was a butchery for political not for religious purposes. The descendants of the Huguenots in this country, and particuliarly in this state, boast of what they know to have been the fact, that their ancestors were anxious to dethrone the French monarchs, and to establish a republic. The unfortunate wars which desolated that fine country, had their origin in this political circumstance. The kings wished to keep their power, the Huguenots desired to strip them. England, always the enemy of France, and now superadding sectarian hatred to her ancient animosity, privately instigated the Protestants, and gave them considerable aid. Upon this the historians of both nations are agreed. At the particular period to which you allude, the unprincipled Mary of Medicis governed a weak monarch. She wished to put down by any means her opponents, and to her and to the family of Guise, is this massacre justly imputed, for their political purposes, by every candid and well-informed historian. The church was opposed to it wherever it had the power to interfere. But, sirs, your 30,000, or your 100,000 killed, is a tremendous guess; even the great John Bull, with all his instinctive terrors of the little sneezing Frenchman, with the mahogany face, is not so good a Munchausen as the clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It was, sirs, a horrible carnage, a wicked, a diabolical complication of murders, but if five thousand persons perished through all France, it was five thousand too many; for no one ought to have been thus slain.

Yet, in most places, the Protestants who escaped, and they were the

vast, the disproportionate majority, generally acknowledged that they were under the greatest obligations to the clergy for their protection. Thus, if Roman Catholics considered the massacre to be an act of religion, they must have looked upon their clergy to have been most irreligious reprobates. Which is it more natural for us to learn the tenets of a church from its documents and from its clergy, or from the atrocious misconduct of perfidious politicians?

Our next topic is the conduct of the Pope. Let us view facts as they were, not as they were not. You gave us a fact stripped of its circumstances. It is a fact that the Pope had a procession to return thanks to God in the Church of Minerva for the safety of the Catholic religion. Now let us clothe this naked fact with its circumstances. The King of France felt, and his court felt, that if it was represented to the world, that a cool, atrocious, unprovoked, and wanton series of murders had been committed, that world would execrate the perpetrators. The Court of France then acted towards the Protestants as the court of Great Britain has, during more than two centuries acted towards the Catholics. It inflicted unwarrantable injury, and feeling its criminal conduct deserved condemnation, it superadded calumny to attempt justification, or at least to palliate its offence.

The King of France wrote to the potentates of Europe, that this massacre was an act of self-defence. He represented the Huguenots as conspiring to massacre him and his court, and as having even made an attempt to commence; but that he felt himself unable to repress the exertions of his loyal subjects who were compelled to slay their enemies to save themselves. This statement found many advocates at the time. It is supported by many historians. But my opinion is that this is a misrepresentation.—Subsequent writers have canvassed the merits of the case, and are at issue still respecting the facts. Upon one circumstance they are all agreed.—The representation made to foreign courts was most unfavourable to the Huguenots. That to the Pope was the most heavily loaded with those charges. It was represented to him that the great object of the Protestants was the extermination of the Catholics, and that this having been providentially discovered and disconcerted by the death of the conspirators: the thanks of every good man, were due to God for such singular and providential interference. The Pope believed this statement, and he ordered a procession to return thanks, not for the murder of human beings, but for the detection of conspirators, and the safety and the providential escape of his flock.

In Rome there were many heathen temples, which after the conversion of the Emperors became Catholic Churches; these frequently were

known as well by their old names, which they had borne for centuries, as by the new names, which they received in Christianity. One of these was called of the Minerva, but in Christianity its designation was *Santa Maria sopra Minerva.* The procession having been to this church, gave to the writer the opportunity of deluding by the equivocal term of the Church of Minerva.

You state that the Pope proclaimed a jubilee to the whole world for this massacre. You are here palpably ignorant or excessively criminal. A jubilee is proclaimed every fiftieth year. This is the year of jubilee, so was the year which was then proclaimed. And you would be just as correct in stating that the present jubilee was published to the Christian world, as a testimony of joy at the arrival of General La Fayette in America, as that jubilee was proclaimed for the Parisian massacre.

Having now, sirs, disposed of your massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve, the same principles will apply to, and explain the revocation of the edict of Nantz, by Louis XIV. Some politicians attempt to justify his policy; others condemn it. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the history of the period, to rank myself deliberately [with] either side. My present impression is decidedly against its policy. My opinion is, however, distinct and unchangeable—that if it originated from a spirit of persecution for the sake of religion, it was an act of gross and criminal injustice.

Now, sirs, we have done with France. You have as a matter of course introduced the Inquisition. I tell you it was not as bad as the Star Chamber. It was more justifiable in its origin, more correct in its proceedings, more impartial in its decisions, and more merciful in its inflictions. You will of course pretend to be startled at all this—I could easily prove my assertions. But it is unnecessary so far as regards you—so far as regards my other readers, it is uncalled for. I shall therefore despatch, in a very few words, all that I have to state. The Inquisition is not, and was not a religious tribunal; it always was a civil tribunal in which clergymen examined as jurors as to the truth of a fact.

Now, sirs, we come to the cursing part. You assert that "Enmity against Protestants is kept up, by an annual execration of them at Rome, on the Thursday of Passion week:—'We excommunicate and curse, all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, and Heretics, and whomsoever shall receive, defend, or favour them."

The mistake of the day is a trifle—it is Maunday Thursday, or Thursday *in Caena Domini*, before Easter.

First, the excommunications of the Bull *in Caena Domini*, as it is called, do not bind, except where the Bull is published. Now, it never was published in America. I have never heard it published or adverted to, except by you, at this side of the Atlantic. It is not received in several Catholic countries in Europe. Suppose it then to be the very worst and most execrable document that could be devised, it is of force only in those places in which it is received, and to which its provisions are applicable. Here it has not been received; here it is not applicable as to the great bulk of its provisions. We shall soon see that some of its clauses are much more pointed against the Holy Alliance than against the inhabitants of the United States. Neither is your translation correct.

Secondly, it is not a cursing document. The meaning of the word curse, at present, is to pray that evil might befall a person. This document does not imprecate a curse upon any person, but it declares that certain persons are excommunicated—that is, "not in the communion of the church," anathematized, that is "placed aside;" which is but a technical expression to convey in its fullest sense a separation from the benefits of the church communion. The church excludes them from her sacraments. Those persons who have left her faith have already proclaimed her sacraments to be delusions—some of them to be idolatry. It is no curse to declare those persons to be separated from our communion; they are placed aside as a body distinct from us—they have erred; and we declare, that if they continue in error, they expose themselves to all its consequences. They have charged us with error, and separated from us, declaring our doctrines were so corrupt that they could not remain in our communion without danger to their souls. They impugn our faith. We say they are in heresy, and we declare them excommunicated, and not to be joined to our body, but kept aside until they renounce their errors.

This is rather the plain declaration of an evident fact than a curse. This is the first clause. Clause 3, excommunicates pirates, and their aiders and abettors. Clause 4, excommunicates those who plunder wrecks or shipwrecked mariners, and continues the excommunication until restitution shall be made. Clause 5, excommunicates those who levy unlawful taxes; this is of course confined to the temporal dominions of the Pope, and to such territories as receive the document; but would, I apprehend be good policy in every place. Clause 6, excommunicates forgers of certain public documents. Perhaps you ought to study the

provisions of this part. Clause 7, would subject to excommunication most of the members of the Holy Alliance, for aiding the Turks with munitions of war against the Greeks.

The other clauses are excommunications denounced against the persons who commit certain murders, robberies, extortions, and so forth, together with their aiders, abettors, and so forth.

To prove more clearly that it is not a cursing document, the same authority which issues it commands that on the next day special prayers shall be publicly and solemnly offered up for the persons who are comprised under the first clause of the excommunication. Besides, the document has only a partial extent; the prayers have a universal extent; the document is not received in America, the prayers are of obligation where the document is received, and where it is not. Here are the prayers, selected from the office of Good Friday:

"*Prayer*: *From the Office of Good Friday.* Let us also pray for all heretics and schismatics, that our Lord God would be pleased to deliver them from all their errors, and call them back to our holy mother, the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

"Celebrant.—Let us pray.

"Deacon.—Let us bend our knees.

"Subdeacon.—Stand up again.

"Celebrant.—O Almighty and Eternal God, who wouldst save all, and have none to perish; look down on those souls that are seduced by the deceits of the devil; that the hearts of those who err, laying aside heretical malice, may repent, and return to the unity of truth, through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. R. *Amen.*"

On every Sunday, the Roman Catholics of America use the following, as part of their form of prayer:

"We pray thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist, with thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude, the President of these United States; that his administration may be conducted in righteousness, and be eminently useful to thy people over whom he presides, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion; by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy; and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all their proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government; so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

"We pray for his excellency, the governor of this state, for the members of assembly, for all judges, magistrates, and other officers, who are appointed to guard our political welfare, that they may be enabled, by thy powerful protection, to discharge the duties of their respective stations with honesty and ability.

"We recommend, likewise, to thy unbounded mercy, all our brethren and fellow-citizens throughout the United States, that they may be blessed in the knowledge, and sanctified in the observance of thy most holy law; that they may be preserved

in union, and in that peace which the world cannot give; and, after enjoying the blessings of this life, be admitted to those which are eternal."

They certainly know that the President is not a Roman Catholic; the great majority of the members of Congress are not Roman Catholics. I doubt, if in both houses, there are ten of the members who belong to our church. I do not know that any one of the state governors is a Roman Catholic; the proportion of judges, magistrates, and other officers, is not very great; and the vast majority of our fellow-citizens are separated from us in communion: they have excommunicated themselves, or their parents have excommunicated them from us; yet we pray for all those. We wish them every blessing, and amongst other good things, we pray that they may be brought to a knowledge of God's holy truth, and sacred law, and to eternal life.

Now, sirs, compare those prayers with the document, the one to be explained by the other. Will you call that excommunication "a curse?" Roman Catholics look upon it to be the greatest misfortune to be separated from the communion of the church; but, sirs, it is not the church which has made the separation: we have only followed in the way of our fathers. You and your associates have gone out from us, and charged us with error, and made separate communions. You have excommunicated yourselves: we only declare the fact. We never curse you. We frequently pray for you. We cannot follow you: but, should you be disposed to return, we shall go to meet you as far as we believe the law of God would permit; we have not driven you out: we do not keep you out. If you agree with us, why not rejoin us? If you disagree with us, why be angry at our declaration, that you are not in our communion? We do not misrepresent your tenets; we do not garble your documents; we do not disguise your facts; we take your doctrines from yourselves: we give your documents entire; we take your own statement of your own facts.

Behold, sirs, a document of the Church of England. This, indeed, is a cursing piece, and the very first curse upon the list is imputing to us a practice of which we are not guilty; and the penultimate one is an insinuation that is also false, that we have left the doctrines of God to follow the traditions of men.

Ignorant as our clergy are generally represented to be, no one of them was ever, I believe, known to commit so gross a blunder as a Welsh parson is said to have been guilty of, in taking up this Commination. "Teer prethren, there are many curses to pe read to tay, put they are too long; so not to telay you, may the curse of Cod pe upon us all." This, if true, was a dreadful blunder. Perhaps, by this time, you are

as sick as I am of curses. This, sirs, is a Church of England document, to be read now once a year; and Mr. Lestrange, a learned commentator upon the Liturgy of that church, shows that it used to be read, at least four times a year, in the early days of that church:

"*A Commination Or Denouncing of God's anger and judgments against Sinners.* With certain Prayers, to be used on the first day of Lent, and at other times, as the Ordinary shall appoint.

After Morning Prayer, the Litany ended, according to the accustomed manner, the Priest shall, in the Reading Pew or Pulpit, say:

"Brethren, in the Primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that, at the beginning of Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin, were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord; and that others, admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend.

"Instead whereof, (until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished,) it is thought good, that at this time, (in the presence of you all,) should be read the general sentence of God's cursing against impenitent sinners, gathered out of the seven-and-twentieth chapter of *Deuteronomy*, and other places of Scripture; and that ye should answer to every sentence, *Amen*: To the intent that, being admonished of the great indignation of God against sinners, ye may the rather be moved to earnest and true repentance, and may walk more warily in these dangerous ways: fleeing from such vices, for which ye affirm with your own mouths the curse of God to be due.

"Cursed is the man that maketh any carved or molten image, to worship it."

"And the People shall answer and say, *Amen.*"

Answer: "*Amen.*"

Minister: "Cursed is he that removeth his neighbour's landmark."

Answer: "*Amen.*"

Minister: "Cursed is he that maketh the blind to go out of his way."

Answer: "*Amen.*"

Minister: "Cursed is he that perverteth the judgment of the stranger, the fatherless, and widow."

Answer: "*Amen.*"

Minister: "Cursed is he that smiteth his neighbour secretly."

Answer: "*Amen.*"

Minister: "Cursed is he that lieth with his neighbour's wife."

Answer: "*Amen.*"

Minister: "Cursed is he that taketh reward to slay the innocent."

Answer: "*Amen.*"

Minister: "Cursed is he that putteth his trust in man, and taketh man for his defence, and in his heart goeth from the Lord."

Answer: "*Amen.*"

"Minister: "Cursed are the unmerciful, fornicators, adulterers, covetous persons, idolaters, slanderers, drunkards, and extortioners."

Answer: "*Amen.*"

In the *Litany* of the Church of England, to be said or sung upon Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and at other times, that is, at least

one hundred and fifty-six times as often as the Roman excommunication, there is this petition:

"From all false doctrine, heresy, and schisms, and so forth. Good Lord, deliver us."

Why do you see the mote in your neighbour's eye, and not cast the beam out of your own?

I shall add two of your articles of religion:

"*Article* xviii. *Of obtaining eternal salvation only by the name of Christ.* They are also to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he protesteth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature; for Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby man must be saved.

"*Article* xxxiii. *Of excommunicated persons, how they are to be avoided.* That person, which by open denunciation of the church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the church by a judge that hath authority thereto."

You have, sirs, lately complained of my letters being severe, gross and personal. I ask you, could any severity be too great for your wanton attack upon the land of my birth and the religion of the great bulk of the Christian world? How many falsehoods have I detected? How much ignorance have I exposed?—How many calumnies have I refuted? The task was easy because the fabrications were palpable; the want of correct information apparent, the desire to injure your fellow-citizens manifest. The language could not be other than severe. There are writers, who, even when they err, should be treated with respect, because they continue to be gentlemen in their manner, though their matter might be censurable; but when the manner is that of an outrageous gladiator, who, in his unrestrained fury rushes to destroy and insult with ribald slander the object of his hate; such a drawcansir is supposed to have none of those feelings which, if existing in himself, he would respect in others.

No man of correct feeling would stuff his article with phrases like the following:—"Dangerous Popish tenets;" "Papists inconsistent with their profession;" "Papists better than their profession;" "Papists having no idea of all the enormous corruptions of the faith they acknowledge;" "The Roman Catholic Church is of its own nature a persecuting church;" "In the Romish Church the more consistent she is with herself, the more of the spirit of persecution will she manifest;" "The Romish Church abstains from persecution only from want of power, or want of Roman Catholic faith!!!" "The persecutions of the Romish Church have exceeded in malignity, cruelty, perseverance, extension and continuance, not only those of all other sects, but even the anti-christian

violence of the Heathens;'' ''Horrible massacres, extensive and exterminating, are perfectly consistent with Roman Catholic doctrine;'' ''Horrible massacre and extermination of Protestants, must be justified by every consistent member of the Romish Church;'' ''Shocking as this is, it arose undoubtedly from the Romish faith;'' ''The Pope was consistent in his savage conduct;'' ''Savage conduct is consistent with the tenets of his infallible Church.'' Here is a pretty collection of phrases in an article of not two octavo pages. And this man complains of gross writing! ! !

Besides this pretty and becoming collection, he compares the Irish Catholics to ''wretched criminals banished'' from their country: ''traitorous conspirators against their country.'' He denounces the American Catholics to their fellow-citizens, as ''opposed to the spirit of toleration;'' as ''opposed to republican institutions;'' as hypocrites whose ''fears occasion their not inculcating in this country doctrines, which, however, they believe;'' as ''hiding in America doctrines which they cannot deny.'' He denounces us, as villanous conspirators of the worst description, ''waiting only till the Romish Church shall be sufficiently powerful in this country to seize torches to burn the Protestants, and scourges to persecute them.'' And this man expects to be treated with courtesy! ! !

There is much in habit. The people of America have been accustomed to find Roman Catholics treated in the manner that you have treated us. But, sirs, if I were to write of Protestants as you have written of Catholics, would any vituperation be considered too gross. You deserve worse treatment than you have received. I have been too lenient, too sparing. But should it be necessary for me to take you up again, do not calculate upon much forbearance. I stand in America upon an equality of right with you: and though I have against me vast prejudice, for which the people of America are not to blame: I have to contend in presence of a discerning, intelligent, patient, investigating people, who love truth and will neither strike me down by the hand of power, nor drown my voice in clamour. They are not like the British Parliament, who put the lock of the law upon the mouth of truth.

You complain of my personality. First, I believed that writers like you did not deserve to have your feelings so very sacredly protected after having outraged, and wantonly outraged the feelings of your unoffending fellow-citizens. Secondly, I feel too deep a respect, too high a regard, too sincere an attachment towards a great number of very respectable members of the Church to which you say you belong, to wound their sensibility by identifying you and them.

Their religion does not urge to such a course as you have chosen;

their charity would protect me from your dagger; their patriotism would save me from your proscription; their candour would disclaim any connexion with your misrepresentations; their information would detect your historic falsehoods. Some of them are the descendants of those very men whose massacre you would charge upon me, a century before my birth. Your malice would sow between us a deadly hate, which, if we permitted to grow, would poison the air by which we are surrounded. Whilst we take each other by the hand, and lament our difference of creed, we unite in charity and affection; we trample upon your unholy cultivation, and whilst I blame and condemn the cruelty of the French court towards their ancestors, their kindness soothes down much of that irritation which the British cruelty has created in me. They tell me, and I agree with them, that it is better to weep over the faults of those, who, professing each creed unholily, persecuted those who professed the other: and taught by the unfortunate sequel of this double crime, we shall endeavour to make America more rational, more charitable, more flourishing than Europe was. Neither will molest the other for the profession of a different creed. Neither will charge upon the church of the other, the crimes of the individuals who might be in that church, and therefore I charge not upon the Protestant Episcopal Church, but upon the Reverend William Hawley and his associates the unfortunate article which I have reviewed.

I am happy to subscribe myself, sirs, in wishing you adieu,

Yours, devotedly,

A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN,

A native of Ireland.

CONTROVERSY WITH "MOUNT ZION MISSIONARY."

[The controversy with the "Mount Zion Missionary," occasioned by some strictures of the editor upon a sermon of Dr. England, preached at Warrenton, Ga., April 5th, 1824, appeared in the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, for 1824-6.]

SECTION I.

The following article is copied from a Georgia paper called the *Missionary*, and is its leading paragraph for April 12. The name of the place of publication is Mount Zion.

We shall always act towards others, as we would they should act towards us. Our readers shall have from the authors themselves the sentiments upon which we shall make comments.

We complain of misrepresentation, we shall not misrepresent.—*Miscellany.*

DOCTOR ENGLAND

"Rarely has a pulpit orator received such encomiums as have been bestowed upon this Roman Catholic Bishop. Many have heard him and acknowledged his powers. That he has a popular address and talents considerably above mediocrity cannot be denied. For without these he could not command the attention of an enlightened community, who are not, to say the least, prejudiced in favour of the Catholic religion. We shall suspend our opinion of his sentiments, till we give an abstract of the only sermon which we have ever heard him deliver—it was on Monday last, at the opening of court at Warrenton. As we rely upon our memory alone, we shall not pretend to draw all the lineaments of this discourse with an accurate pencil, and we would crave his indulgence for the unfinished and mutilated manner in which we shall present it, promising, at the same time, to submit to any corrections which either he or those who heard him may think proper to make.

After an introduction in which he mentioned the embarrassment under which he appeared, as an advocate of a religion against which the prejudices of the community were enlisted—as the minister of a church whose tenets had been grossly misrepresented—of a church the

doctrines of which were but little understood in this country, but which he was assured from the convictions of his own judgment were pure, and established on the only sure foundation,—he observed, that the Roman Catholic was a persecuted religion—that we had not the means of knowing its principles—that the books which are dispersed among us, from which our information is derived with respect to the Catholic Church, are replete with falsehoods—that they were forged across the Atlantic and palmed upon the world by the very persons who had persecuted them there, that they might have some excuse for their cruelty; that if their tenets were such as were represented in these books, he would abjure the faith of his church—that the Roman Catholics were persecuted by the first settlers of this state—that the principles of toleration were unknown here till after the Declaration of Independence—that even since that time the prejudices of the community against them had abated but little—that though the number of members attached to his church was exceedingly limited in the United States, yet as a body throughout the world, they always were a vast majority of professed believers; that at no period within a number of centuries have they been less than one hundred and fifty millions—that at the present time their number exceeds one hundred and eighty millions, and are found in every part of the world—that their church had existed in its present form for eighteen hundred years, and that it pointed out the way in which, according to the deepest convictions of his own soul, he ought to worship the God of his fathers.

Touching the misrepresentations which had been made of his church, he observed, that they were accused of being hostile to republican institutions. This charge he denied, and adduced the Republic of Venice, several Italian states, San Marino several of the Catholic states of Germany, and the Swiss cantons, as examples of republics that owed their origin to Catholics. Recurring to our own history, he observed, that in the first settlement of this country, the Puritans of New England persecuted all but Puritans, and the High Church of Virginia, all but the members of the church, while Catholic Maryland alone manifested a spirit of toleration. In further proof he mentioned the venerable Charles Carroll, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, a Catholic who pledged a million of dollars on the issue. The religion of his church, he said, was compatible with all kinds of government—that was left entirely with man, but matters of faith rested upon the authority of God.

But the Inquisition is a part of the Papal system. This he also denied, and argued that if it were, it would have existed wherever the Ro-

man Catholic was the prevailing system. That in no Catholic countries was the Inquisition established, with the exception of Spain, Portugal, Burgundy, and in a few other small states—that the church had existed for twelve centuries before the Inquisition—that it was a civil enactment which had no more connexion with their religion than the penal code of any other country has with its religion—that it owed its origin to the civil state of the society, the Moors becoming so base that they would not testify against each other, and to prevent a recurrence of the injury which had been sustained in consequence of their ravages, it was resolved to punish the principle wherever they could find it, inferring from the principle the overt act—that clergymen were selected as the most proper persons to test the principle—that they exercised their office with the greatest lenity in accordance with the laws—that though the Inquisition had existed in Catholic countries, nothing appeared from its history that it formed any part of their religion—that he utterly condemned the measure, because it did not allow the accused to confront the accuser.

Another objection. The Roman Catholics are accused of granting indulgences to commit sin for a stipulated sum paid to the priest. This he affirmed was never a doctrine of his church. What connexion, he asked, can there be between giving money to a priest and the pardon of sin? Man, he said, could not grant a permission to sin, nor even God himself, because it would be contrary to the sanctity of his nature. It carried on its very front too much absurdity to gain credit. Society would never have existed if such a doctrine had prevailed. For every person could then, with perfect impunity, by paying a small stipend, plunge a dagger into the bosom of his neighbour—neither the person nor the property of any would be safe. As the greatest statesmen and jurists that the world has ever produced have been Catholics, it was the supremacy of folly to suppose that they would sanction any such doctrine.

With respect to the principles of his church, he observed, that they held but one, and that was doing what God told them to do. This principle he divided into three branches. God has told us to believe—we believe. God has told us to practise—we practise. God has told us to adhere to certain ordinances—we adhere to them. Religion is not a matter of opinion but of faith. But how do we know that God has spoken to man? By a miracle? What is a miracle? That which is contrary to the common operations of nature, and which none but God can effect. When something is done which no created being can do, we know God is there. But we cannot comprehend a miracle. We believe a million of things which we cannot comprehend. I speak, I cannot tell how—

it is a mystery to me. You hear, I cannot tell how. I raise my arm and crook my finger—I cannot tell how. The sun shines, the grass grows, fishes live in the sea, all is a mystery which no philosopher has ever been able to explain. But how do we know that God has spoken to man, or that a miracle has been performed? By competent witnesses, witnesses who had no interest to deceive, and who could not deceive even if they had an interest in it. On the testimony of these witnesses we believe. Now if the Scriptures were true eight or ten centuries ago, they are true now. Every syllable of the Scriptures we believe to be the word of God. But two men may read the same passage of Scripture and each give a different interpretation to it. They cannot both be right, and they may both be wrong. Now who is to decide? There must be an umpire, and that is the province of the Church, the collected wisdom of the bishops who deliberate upon it, and their ultimate decision, must give the true interpretation. What the majority of the bishops determine to be the doctrines of Scripture or the ordinances of God, we are bound to adhere to as infallible.

In giving the foregoing abstract we are not conscious of having misrepresented any of his positions, yet we are fully sensible that the force and symmetry and connexion of the discourse are by no means preserved. If they are a persecuted people we wish not to be the persecutors. If we have laboured, in common with other Protestants, under prejudices without foundation, we pray that they may be removed by the light of truth. In the remarks which we shall subjoin, we would not intentionally throw a straw in the way of those who are following in the path of our Saviour. While it becomes the Christian to overlook minor differences, yet there are principles so radically erroneous that he cannot acquit his conscience without bearing his testimony against them.

Our means of becoming acquainted with the Roman Catholic religion are not so limited as the learned bishop may suppose. We have Catholic as well as Protestant books—we have books too which have been written by persons who professedly maintained no greater interest for the one than the other. We have records of facts which nothing but the greatest incredulity can discredit. We have books published in Catholic countries which the ecclesiastical authority has condemned, and books on which no censure has been passed. We, therefore, cannot want the means of information necessary to become acquainted with the principles and character of the Roman Catholic Church. From a critical examination of all the sources from which information with respect to that church is derived, the following appear to be doctrines which have been peculiarly favourable to its existence and power.

1. That the government of the Church is monarchical, and that the Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all churches and over all ecclesiastics.

2. That the Pope possesses temporal power over all the goods and possessions of all Christians, to dispose of them as he pleases, even to the tranferring kingdoms from one to another.

3. That the laws of the Pope are obligatory, and bind the consciences of all men.

4. That the civil power ought to be united with the ecclesiastical—so that the Pope is not only a spiritual pastor, but a temporal prince.

5. That ecclesiastics are not subject in any respect to the laws of temporal princes.

6. The election of pastors they consider as belonging to bishops, but especially to the Pope—so that no one is acknowledged who has not been ordained by them to office.

7. That the Pope is subject to no human tribunal—that he is superior to councils, and that he is infallible in the exercise of his authority.

8. That the sacred Scripture owes its authority to the Church (i. e. the Pope,) without whose testimony we should be no more bound to receive it than Livy or the Koran.

9. That the Church has a right to determine what are the articles of faith which should be believed.

10. The decisions of the Pope in matters of faith are infallible, for he cannot err.

11. He is the interpreter of Scripture, and the arbiter of all controversies which may arise.

12. No one of the laity is permitted to read the sacred Scriptures unless he shall have obtained leave of the bishop. The reason which they assign for this is their obscurity.

13. Knowledge is, therefore, excluded from being the foundation of faith, and ignorance is considered as having a better title to be connected with faith.

14. Implicit faith is highly recommended.

15. They define faith to be a general assent to all things revealed by God and proposed to us by the Church, written or unwritten.

16. They maintain that there is no necessity of translating the Scriptures into other than the Latin tongue, which was consecrated on the cross.

17. They assert that the sacred Scriptures are imperfect, and do

not contain all things necessary to faith and practice, which defect is supplied by traditions preserved in the Romish Church.

18. That there is no need of any argument besides tradition; so that all the innovations which they have made in the worship of God are supported by having recourse to traditions.

We will pass over the doctrine of absolution with all its appendages, and the works of supererogation which are made up of the superabundant sufferings of Christ and his saints, a vast treasury of which the Pope has at his disposal, lest we may mistake them as applying to the doctrine of indulgences, as it is commonly understood among Protestants. If the above have been the doctrines of the Church (and what has been is now, for the Church is infallible,) we find many things which it is impossible for us to reconcile with the word of God. How is it that Christ said his kingdom was not of this world, and yet the vice-regent of Christ exercises a temporal power? How is it that the doctrine of traditions is condemned by Christ, and yet the successors of Christ built their faith upon them? How is it that the Church is infallible when one council and one Pope has reversed the decrees of another? What logic is that by which the authority of the Pope is proved from the Scriptures, and the Scriptures from the authority of the Pope? We know not but that the Catholic religion is compatible with every form of government, but it is a matter of fact that the Popes have claimed a dominion over the civil power of all governments. That even the Senate of Venice, when they suppressed by an edict, in 1767, the Inquisition in all the smaller towns, and reduced their power to a shadow in larger cities, and extended the liberty of the press, they did it in steady opposition to the repeated remonstrances of the Court of Rome. The Roman Catholic religion may be compatible with a republican form of government, provided the temporal and spiritual supremacy of the Pope is acknowledged. For if they once possessed a divine right over kingdoms, they must possess it still—if they have once claimed temporal as well as spiritual supremacy, they must always claim it, or the doctrine of infallibility must fall.

With respect to the Inquisition, if one hundredth part of what is said of it be true, it must receive the execration of every individual who has the least feeling of humanity. But we are told that it forms no part of the Catholic religion, that it is a mere civil enactment, that has no more connexion with Papacy than the penal code of this state has with its religion. For argument's sake we will admit it. But we must be permitted to revert to its origin, and the means by which this ghostly engine has been supported. Under the protection of Raymond VI., Earl of Toulouse, the dissenters from the Church of Rome increased rapidly

in Narbonne, Gaul, and the countries adjacent. Pope Innocent III. informed of their success, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, commissioned Ranier and Pierre de Castelneau, and sent them as legates extraordinary into the southern parts of France, to perform the benevolent work of extirpating heresy, without regard to the means by which it should be effected. These spiritual champions soon associated with them others, among whom was the Spaniard Dominic, founder of the order of Dominicans. And if they did not inflict capital punishment upon any of those whom they could not convert by exhortations and arguments, we know not what credit can be attached to any ecclesiastical history. In common parlance they were called Inquisitors, and from them the formidable and odious tribunal called the Inquisition, derived its origin. Inquisitors were placed in almost every city where there were any suspected of heresy, even before the Council of Toulouse in 1229, at which Romanus, Cardinal of St. Angelo and Pope's legate, presided, where it was decreed that there should be a Council of Inquisitors in every city, consisting of one priest and three laymen. But this was superseded by Pope Gregory IX. in 1233, who entrusted the Dominicans with the important commission of discovering and bringing to judgment the heretics that were lurking in France. This is the period from which the full establishment of the Inquisition may be dated. And although it may be a civil enactment, it owed its origin to the Romish Church, and it has received the sanction of most, if not all the Holinesses to the present day. What must we think of those who founded this horrible institution? Ah! and what must we think of those who have supported it? If it was not established by the Popes, who established it? They have sanctioned it—that is enough.

We turn now to the doctrine of indulgences. Did we understand the bishop when he said this was never a doctrine of his church? Does he deny that the traffic of indulgences was begun by the bishops in the twelfth century, and afterwards monopolized by the Popes? Did they not publish a plenary remission of all the temporal pains and penalties which the church had annexed to certain transgressions, when their coffers wanted replenishing? Did they not go further, and usurp the authority which belongs to God alone, by impiously pretending to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity? If we rested these facts on Protestant history alone, they might be objected to as interested and calumnious testimony. But Catholic writers mention it as well as Protestant. It seems to us, therefore, too notorious to be denied. If the Church of Rome has been corrupt, let her ministers confess it. It will not add to her glory to attempt

to throw a flimsy veil over her past deformities—nor will it entitle them to any more credit on other points which they may wish to establish. Her spotless purity they never can prove, whatever may be their success in propagating her doctrines."

Such is the text. We shall not now proceed to make any remarks—but portions of many of our succeeding numbers must be devoted to this precious piece of specious declamation, and gross tissue of misrepresentation of [the] doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.

As for the prelate whose name is prefixed to the article, we are authorized by him to say, that if the writer imagines his production to be a fair outline of the bishop's sermon, he is convinced that one of two occurrences has taken place; the writer did not understand what the bishop preached, or the bishop totally forgets what he spoke himself.

One thing he asserts with confidence. His discourse had more semblance of reasoning, than the folly to which he is made to give utterance in proving that God has spoken to man.

SECTION II.

In our last we gave the article from this paper, which purported to be an outline of Dr. England's sermon at Warrenton, and the objections to the Roman Catholic religion, by the editor of the said paper. We have no doubt that our readers were as much astonished as we were at the exhibition of eighteen new articles of Catholic faith. We feel disposed to treat the editor of the *Missionary* with respect, but we must avow, we have sometimes been almost tempted beyond our strength to change that feeling.

In the sermon he mentions the Bishop's having stated, that he was "the minister of a church whose tenets had been grossly misrepresented" —"of a church, the doctrines of which were but little understood in this country." The Bishop, we are authorized to state, avows the expression. Dr. England did state at Warrenton, that the tenets of Roman Catholics were grossly misrepresented—that the doctrines of Roman Catholics were but little understood in this country. Upon this point the editor of the *Missionary* closes with the Bishop at once and asserts:

"Our means of becoming acquainted with the Roman Catholic religion are not so limited as the learned Bishop supposes. We have Catholic as well as Protestant books—we have books too which have been written by persons who professedly maintained no greater interest for the one than the other. We have records of facts which nothing but the greatest incredulity can discredit. We have books published in Catholic countries which the ecclesiastical authority has condemned, and books on which no censure has been passed. We, therefore, cannot want the means of informa-

tion necessary to become acquainted with the principles and character of the Roman Catholic Church."

Now one would naturally suppose the writer of such a paragraph as this must have felt himself upon strong grounds, and we find that besides having had the opportunity, he has made use of the means—for he goes on to say:

"From a critical examination of all the sources from which information with respect to that church is derived, the following appear to be doctrines which have been peculiarly favourable to its existence and power."

Now who can doubt but the editor of the *Missionary* must be well informed, because he has examined "all the sources from which information with respect to that church is derived"—and not merely examined them in a cursory way, not even with ordinary care, but "critically."—"From a critical examination," and so forth.

Thus his very first point of difference with the Bishop is upon a fact. The Bishop says, "Our tenets are not understood by you,"—"You do not know our doctrines." The *Missionary* says, "We do understand your tenets,"—"We do know your doctrines."

Which of the two are we to believe? Let us look to the facts before we draw our conclusions. The *Missionary* states the Bishop to have said, as to the knowledge of the tenets by the people of Georgia—

"That we had not the means of knowing its principles—that the books which are dispersed among us, from which our information is derived with respect to the Catholic church, are replete with falsehood—that they were forged across the Atlantic and palmed upon the world by the very persons who had persecuted them there, that they might have some excuse for their cruelty; that if their tenets were such as were represented in these books he would abjure the faith of his church."

The Bishop informs us that although he did not use the expressions here given in the way in which they are put, and conveying the same unlimited meaning as to the forgery, still he did say that many documents held forth as genuine were forged, and that he specially alluded to the document given in Guthrie's *Geography*, as containing the prices for pardon of sins—and confined the charge of forgery to that and a few other documents: still he has no objection to allow the above paragraph to be taken as his. We will, therefore, suppose this paragraph to have been the expression in the sermon. The *Missionary* answers—"We have books not forged and of which your church approves; they contain your doctrine. We have critically examined them. We do, therefore, know your doctrines."

So far we have brought the parties ready for the proof. The Bishop disappears—the *Missionary* comes forward, and after his critical examination of all the sources, he produces eighteen propositions of Catholic doctrine. Now, though he should have been correct in all the eighteen,

still this would only prove that so far as he went, he was well informed, but there might be many more of which he was ignorant. So that happening to give a few doctrines correctly, is not a proof that he knew those which he did not give. Besides, the *Missionary* will not contend that because he has all those sources of information which he enumerates, therefore they are generally open to every one else in Georgia. Neither will he contend, that because he examined critically all those sources, therefore every other person in Georgia examined them all critically. A fine library of religious books, and critical acumen, are two great blessings, for which the *Missionary* ought to be duly thankful, without despising those who are bereft of both, and we unfortunately are of the number of the destitute.

Surely then the editor of the *Missionary*, a gentleman of such a powerful memory as to be able to bring away a whole sermon upon two or three topics altogether new to him, over a space of fifty or sixty miles; a gentleman who deals out weekly selections of religious news, which is brought daily to him upon the wings of the winds—a gentleman of extensive information, of sound critical knowledge—with a fine library "of Catholic as well as Protestant books"—and "books which have been written by persons who professedly maintained no greater interest for the one than the other"—that is, we suppose, Deists and Infidels. Of course excellent commentators upon Catholic doctrines. Than him it is impossible, one would imagine, to find in all Georgia a person better qualified to know what are "the principles and the character of the Roman Catholic Church." We will grant the editor the full benefit of his conclusion, that he has had extraordinary opportunities—opportunities much better than most of his neighbours. But we only ask in return, a fair concession from him, viz.: That very few, if any other persons in Georgia had so good an opportunity. Do we go too far when we say none had better? Now we ask him in sober candour, does not the exception confirm the general rule? He will not ask us to allow that the same opportunities were possessed by the people of Georgia generally—he knows they are not. Therefore, though we should admit that he had good opportunities and did turn them to account, still would the Bishop's assertion be true—that the people generally had not. We will venture to assure the gentleman that the Bishop was not aware of the honour which was conferred upon him by having so well-informed a Christian scholar amongst his hearers, or we know that Prelate's politeness so well that we have no doubt he would have made an exception in his favour. And indeed we intend to supply the omission before we conclude, if our alternative be acceptable.

Our readers must now perceive that although the editor of the *Missionary* was well acquainted with Catholic tenets, and could give eighteen of them without making the slightest blunder, after having critically examined all the sources of Catholic doctrine; still as he shone alone like the sun in the firmament of Georgia—the Bishop was not so blamable in asserting that the tenets of his religion were generally misunderstood.

We may be pardoned our boldness if after such opportunities of information, if after such critical examination, we venture to handle those eighteen propositions, so regularly classified, so accurately distinguished. One reason for our presumption is, that the *Missionary* informs us they are so erroneous "that he cannot acquit his conscience without bearing his testimony against them." Really, besides to a good library and critical acumen, we are moved to think, a tender conscience is the next best blessing which God can bestow. O! how enviable is the lot of the *Missionary*, upon whom all these blessings are so profusely poured out! ! !

"In the remarks which we shall subjoin, we would not intentionally throw a straw in the way of those who are following in the path of our Saviour. While it becomes the Christian to overlook minor differences, yet there are principles so radically erroneous that he cannot acquit his conscience without bearing his testimony against them."

Now, having paid all due deference to the superior claims of this gentleman to a knowledge of the tenets of our church, we have perused his eighteen propositions which may be found in page 279 of our last number; and we do most coolly and deliberately, and after mature reflection and critical examination, pronounce sixteen of them to be, as they are expressed by him, and with the meaning which they have in his context, palpable errors; of the other two, one is, as put by the editor of the *Missionary*, equivocal, and therefore may be rejected or received, according to the sense which is given to it. So that the only article of Catholic belief which is fairly and properly put, is one, which is the 15th, viz., the definition of faith. That which is equivocal is the 17th.

We shall take them all in succession for separate and calm investigation, as also the subsequent remarks, which are equally objectionable.

The original question for us here, was as to the fact stated by the Bishop and denied by the *Missionary*, The Bishop told the people at Warrenton, "our tenets have been misrepresented to you"—"you do not know our doctrines." The *Missionary* answers, "The Bishop mistakes: we have his books; his tenets have not been misrepresented"—"his doctrines are well known"—"I will tell you eighteen of them." He makes

the enumeration, and of the eighteen, sixteen are misrepresentations. Upon this we cannot be deceived. We know the doctrines of our church. We have read those imputed to it by the *Missionary*. We know them to be misrepresentations. Therefore the Bishop was perfectly correct when he stated at Warrenton, that he was "the minister of a church whose tenets had been grossly misrepresented"—"of a church, the doctrines of which were but little understood in this country;" and never was any position more clearly proved, and more fully established, than was this proposition by the editor of the *Missionary*, published at Mount Zion, in Hancock County, Georgia, who stated that he had all the means of knowing the character and tenets of that church, and that he had critically examined the same, and then published to the world an exposition thereof, eight-ninths of which, at least, was gross misrepresentation. Therefore the said editor either did not know that he was misrepresenting, and therefore has not understood what were the doctrines of the church,—or he did know and did wilfully misrepresent the same. We leave to him his choice of the alternative; and we feel confident that it is the excess of charity to attribute his mistakes to want of knowledge, when he assures us that he had a fine library, critical acumen, and a tender conscience to boot! ! !

Now, if this gentleman of such extensive knowledge be in error, as to the tenets of our church, what must we say of the other good people? Will it be profanation to apply the text, "If the light that is in thee be darkness, and so forth?"

We have now lying before us a volume of Dr. Hay's work on miracles. We see the editor of the *Missionary* is on this topic too. But more of that anon. The first passage which has caught our eye is so much to the purpose, that we cannot avoid transcribing it:

"It is too often the case in disputes about religion, every one thinks himself quite master of the subject, though, in reality, his knowledge of it be exceedingly superficial; he forms to himself, for the most part, very false and unjust ideas of the tenets of his adversaries, and in fighting against them, he only combats the phantom of his own fancy: hence, there is no end to wrangling, nor to numbers of very improper, nay, impious expressions which are uttered on such occasions," and so forth.

Now, we do solemnly assure the editor of the *Missionary*, that we do join Bishop England in that expression which he says was used, given as in the outline of the sermon, page 277, "that if the tenets of the Roman Catholics were such as were represented in these books, he would abjure the faith of his church." We say, if the propositions which the editor of the *Missionary* gives as our tenets, were the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, we would abjure that church. Why, then, in the name of common honesty, will these good people be telling the world

that they know us better than we know ourselves? Why will they continue to attribute to us doctrines which we never held? Why combat the phantoms of their own creation, and then boast that they have vanquished us?

Again, the *Missionary* asks:

How is it that the church is infallible, when one Council and one Pope have reversed the decrees of another?

We say to the editor of the *Missionary*, as we before said to the editor of the *Unitarian Miscellany*, produce one General Council of the Roman Catholic Church which has reversed the decision of another General Council of the Roman Catholic Church upon an Article of Faith, and we will abjure the Roman Catholic religion. [72]

We may be allowed to ask a question in our turn. We, then, ask the editor, Is it honest to assume as a fact that which is a falsehood? We recollect a statement respecting some mighty philosopher, who was occupied during a long time, in the critical examination, as to what could be the cause of a certain effect. After much inquiry, he avowed that he could not discover any sufficient cause; when some simple being asked him, whether he had evidence that the alleged effect had been produced; and he very wisely acknowledged, that he had not adverted before to the possibility that there was no evidence; and in fact there was none. "Then," said his simple friend, "you might have saved yourself the trouble of inquiring how anything can exist, until you have proof that it did exist." Let us give evidence of the fact. Our pledge is before the world.

Then we have another misrepresentation.

The *Missionary* asks:

"What logic is that by which the authority of the Pope is proved from the Scriptures, and the Scriptures from the authority of the Pope?"

We answer, "No logic, or bad logic." For our answer we refer to our last number, page 307. [Vol. II. p. 210.]

We ask, "What information is that which attributes to persons doctrines which they do not believe?"

"What honesty is that which accuses a church of folly, which is known not to belong thereto?"

There we have another misrepresentation—O! that we had to do with men who would print only the truth!! But the torture, the affliction of being perpetually occupied in an Augean stable, in which all

[72] See the *Controversy* respecting several Sovereign Pontiffs, in Part III.

the imported falsehoods of unprincipled European writers of three centuries are deposited! ! We doubt that the united floods of the Savannah and the Altamaha would cleanse even Mount Zion itself. We must resume our remarks.

SECTION III.

In our last, we examined partially the preliminary observations of the editor of the *Missionary*, of April 12. We there vindicated, upon a general view, the truth of Doctor England's assertion at Warrenton, "that the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion were not generally known in Georgia."

We now proceed to take up the alleged propositions of Roman Catholic doctrine adduced by the editor as peculiarly obnoxious:

"1. That the government of the church is monarchical, and that the Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all other churches and over all ecclesiastics."

This proposition is compounded of three parts. 1. The government of the church is monarchical. 2. The Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all other churches. 3. The Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all ecclesiastics.

Nothing is more destructive of truth and charity than to write hastily and indistinctly upon important subjects of religion, without thoroughly investigating facts, and examining words. Monarchy is where the power of governing is completely and solely in an individual; and no government is properly monarchical, where there is a restraint upon the individual who is said to govern. The derivation of the word will clearly show its meaning,—μονος sole, and αρκη government. Where the individual is restricted in the exercise of power, it is sometimes said to be a limited monarchy, but it is more properly a mixed form of government. When the power is restricted, the government ceases to be a monarchy. Our present object not being to write a treatise upon church government, nor to describe government in general, but to show that the government of the Roman Catholic Church is not monarchical, we shall not keep longer from facts.

The Pope has great power in governing the church, but he is not the sole governor thereof—therefore he is not a monarch, though he is the principal governor. His power extends to all persons, to all places, but not to all acts, therefore he is not a monarch of the church. Without entering into a discussion of the question, whether the Pope be superior to the general councils, or general councils superior to the Pope, one prin-

ciple is undoubted: if he were to make a general law, and a general council to make a law in contradiction thereto, the person who would adhere to the council against the Pope, would not thereby cease to be a well-conducted Roman Catholic,—would not thereby become a rebel to church government: therefore the power of government is not solely in the Pope—therefore the government is not monarchical. [73]

To omit a vast number of authors who may be quoted, we shall confine ourselves to Cardinal Bellarmine, than whom no writer of our church more fiercely contended for the most extensive Papal power. His whole scope in his treatise *De Romano Pontifice*, was to raise as high as possible the Pope's authority, and to confine, as far as he could, all power to the holy father. In this treatise, book i., chapter 9, he gives as his proposition—*Quod regimen Ecclesiasticum praecipue Monarchicum esse debeat*, "That the government of the church ought to be chiefly monarchical." The cardinal, who knew our religion at least equally as well as does the editor of the *Missionary*, and who examined critically all the sources of information, with at least as much care and ability as did our Georgian friend, and who was equally anxious to prove the government of the church monarchical, though urged by a very different motive from that of the editor, knew that if he laid down his proposition *est monarchicum*, "is monarchial," he could not sustain it, because such was not the fact. His opinion was that it ought to be, not that it was,—principally, not purely monarchical. If the Cardinal gave this opinion, "it ought to be purely monarchical," he knew it would be censured, for he was too good a theologian not to be aware that it would be expres-

[73] It is not easy to understand how the Bishop can deny that the Catholic Church is a Monarchy. It is the common teaching of theologians and canonists that Christ established in the Church a true monarchy. According to Bellarmine, in chapter one of the work quoted by Dr. England, there are three forms of government: The Monarchy, the Aristocracy, and the Democracy. Monarchy, in the common acceptation of the word, and as defined by Bellarmine, is "that form of government which places the supreme power in the hands of one man who is without superior or equal and is independent of people and princes."

From this definition it follows that three things are required to institute a Monarchy — unity of power in the ruler — universality of subjection in the ruled — undivided supreme power in the ruler.

Now, it is evident that these three essentials are verified in the fundamental constitution of the Church. For, the plenitude of supreme power in the Church was conferred by Christ on St. Peter, and remains in its integrity amongst the successors of St. Peter — the faithful exercise no power in the government of the Church—and the Bishops, considered individually or collectively, depend on the successor of St. Peter; and this successor is so independent of the Bishops that the power and efficiency of his decrees are absolutely beyond their consent or control. Every element of the monarchy is found in the Church. A careful study of Bellarmine's work, *De Romano Pontifice*, justifies the statement that the government of the Church is strictly and absolutely monarchial. This proposition is maintained by Cardinal Ursius and a vast body of theologians. The difference between Bellarmine and other writers on this question is merely a difference of words.—*Ed.*

sing a desire to change the government from what Christ had made it, and therefore to do that which it would not be lawful for all the popes, bishops, priests, and people united, during all the centuries of the church to do, viz., to substitute in the church a government of man's institution for that which Christ had established. The Cardinal knew that Christ did not establish in the church a pure monarchy. He knew the government of the church was not monarchical—but his opinion was that it ought to be principally monarchical. In the preceding chapter (8) his proposition was *Quod non sit Ecclesiasticum regimen praecipue penes Episcopos*, "That the government of the church is not principally in the power of the bishops." Thus, the Cardinal's notion of church government appears to be, that it was not monarchical, but that neither was it principally in the bishops—but that it ought to be principally in the Pope. In a word, that it was in the Pope and bishops jointly, which certainly is not a monarchy; and where there are so many hundred bishops, it is not an oligarchy: and where the place of pope and of bishop is open to every qualified member of the church, who may be lawfully chosen thereto, and does not descend by hereditary right, it is not an aristocracy. But it is a mixed government, in which Cardinal Bellarmine is of opinion that the Pope has the principal power; but many equally good divines are of opinion that the bishops have the principal power, though all acknowledge that the Pope has the primacy of honour and of jurisdiction. The doctrine of the church is, that the power of government is in the Pope and bishops, and that the Pope is primate in honour and in jurisdiction throughout the world. Any opinion as to the mode of division which leaves this doctrine untouched, may be held by Roman Catholics; and this doctrine is not that church government is monarchical.

The same Cardinal, in his treatise on the authority of councils, book ii., chapter 14, enumerates the opinions of orthodox Catholics upon the question of the exact limits of Papal authority in councils. In the seventh paragraph, we have the following Catholic, orthodox opinion:—"Others will have it that the Pope is in the church, what the Doge is in the Venetian republic. Now it is plain that the Doge is superior to each of the magistrates, and to each of the senators, and is over each and every of the Venetian cities, and over them all; but yet he is not greater than the assembled senate; and when the Doge dies, it is certain that the entire ducal authority is in the senate."

This opinion is, by the avowal of Bellarmine himself, held by a very large portion of the best Roman Catholics: amongst these writers are several eminent cardinals, bishops, and theologians, and men noted for

their piety and attachment to the Holy See, equally as for their literature. Amongst those quoted by the Cardinal, was the celebrated Gerson. We could produce hundreds of instances, but we have intentionally confined ourselves to quoting from this writer, who is most favourable to the position which the editor at Mount Zion would like to establish.

Thus, we have the most strenuous advocate for the Papacy in the days of Sixtus V., assuring us that they are good Catholics who say that the government of the church is of that nature that we may liken the authority of the Pope to that of the Doge of Venice. Now, good friend, you appear to know something of the republic of Venice, for you write in favour of its acts, in the very article which we are examining. Upon your tender conscience, we ask you to testify, "was the government of Venice monarchical?" Do we go too far now for our evidence, when we say that in part 1, of your first proposition, you misrepresent our doctrine?

But the Pope is over all the rest, therefore it is monarchical.

We answer, but the governor of the state of Georgia is over all the other officers of the state, therefore the government of Georgia is monarchical.

No, for the governor must act in concurrence with the other branches of government: his power is limited. We add, the Pope must act in concurrence with the other branches of the government: his power is limited.

But Georgia has her constitution. Look to article 2, you will find the powers of the governor limited very closely. We answer, examine with a little more critical care than you have done, and you will find that Governor Troup has more extensive constitutional power in Georgia, than Pope Leo XII. has in the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore its government is not monarchical.

The fabricators in Europe, who misrepresent the Catholic tenets, have made the statement—their vile press has propagated the falsehood—the people of Georgia, and amongst the rest, the editor at Mount Zion, read the libel—they believed it. We, who are Roman Catholics, assure them that they have been deceived. The fault has not been theirs. Why will they now make it their own? Why not honestly avow, what is no disgrace to them, that they had not before had the means of detecting the error, and of correcting the evil. We cannot blame them if they have been imposed upon. But they cannot blame us, when in answer to their charge of our willing submission to a degrading and impious slavery, we prove that they have been imposed upon, that we are not what they have been told we were. But if, after we exhibit the

proof of their mistake, and show that we are not what we were described to be—if, after the fact is made manifest, they should tell us that they do not believe our words, and that they know our tenets better than we know them ourselves, and that we do believe what we deny, and submit to what we reject, we must lose our respect for those who would treat us in so unbecoming a manner; and truth would compel us to say, they might have been hitherto innocently and excusably in error; but they can no longer lay claim to innocence, or plead the absence of malice, the love of truth. We may pray for them, but we cannot esteem them. Thank God, however, this is not the general characteristic of the people of Georgia; they do love truth, but they are desirous of evidence before they yield their assent. In this they are right.

The second clause of this first proposition is, "The Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all other churches."

This clause is so extremely vague, that we are perfectly at a loss what to say to it. According to the meaning of the words supreme power, would our answer be—If by these words was only meant that the Pope has, in every diocess in the whole world, that authority which Roman Catholics believe to be in him, by virtue of the commission which he has, the place which he fills, we admit the clause to be true, but we do not admit that supreme power to be unlimited. We allow that if St. Peter were alive and came into Georgia, and examined into the state of the church there, he would, by virtue of his commission from our blessed Saviour, have more extensive power than any other person in the church of Georgia, to make the necessary regulations; and as we believe his successor enjoys, by virtue of the same commission, similar power derived from the same source, so we believe he could act in like way.

But if it be meant by supreme power, that he has a despotic authority to act according to his caprice, and without rule or control, we believe no such doctrine.

The governor of a state has supreme power in all parts of that state, and in every part thereof, yet he cannot do what he pleases in any one town or village. There may be a supreme regulated power—this we admit; but the supremacy of the regulation is over the supremacy of the individual, who acts in conformity thereto. Our blessed Saviour made the regulations, and gave the supremacy, founded upon the regulations. In acknowledging supremacy, we repel despotism.

As regards the third clause: "The Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all ecclesiastics," our answer must be founded upon the meaning of the words supreme power. If the words be taken unlimitedly, the proposition is false. Its truth or falsehood will always

depend upon the boundaries within which the power is circumscribed. But taking both those clauses to have meaning in accordance with the other propositions, or even with the first clause of this same proposition, both the second and third clauses are contradictions to our doctrine. Therefore, in each of its parts, and in the whole, the proposition number one, is a misrepresentation of the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church.

But, what in the name of common sense are we to do with the next?

"2. That the Pope possesses temporal power over all the goods and possessions of all Christians, to dispose of them as he pleases, even to the transferring kingdoms from one to another."

You have read it correctly. Yes; it is that the Pope has temporal power over all the goods and possessions of all Christians, to dispose of them as he pleases, even to the transferring of kingdoms from one to another! Upon the principle of *odiosa restringenda*, we should, as soon as possible, put in our plea to confine the power to kingdoms, lest his Holiness might claim to extend his jurisdiction to republics, upon the principle of *favores ampliandae*. May Heaven protect this good republic, and all others of this Union, from the consequences, if we should be given up to the Holy Alliance! ! !

Now, were we disposed to amuse ourselves, what scope is given to the imagination? And, really, we scarcely know how to be serious in this case. Let us see, on one side, his Holiness Pope Leo XII. granting to his trusty and well-beloved son, King George IV., his old American possessions, and the Duke of Wellington sent out to take possession; and, on the other side, the American Catholics called upon to give up their possessions. Now, does the editor of the *Missionary* believe the Catholics of Louisiana would desert Old Hickory, who, no doubt, would be sent to New Orleans again, if necessary? Let us suppose the Catholics disaffected, and the General a little more accommodating than usual. He waits upon the Bishop, bows to him, and, kneeling, asks his blessing to win his heart. Doctor Dubourg requests the General to be seated, and the following dialogue takes place:

Bishop. My dear General, I am charmed, truly delighted to meet you, and quite edified by your piety. Can I do anything to serve you? to gratify you?

Gen. You recollect, sir, I protected New Orleans on a former occasion from British rapacity and profligacy: for which, you prayed the blessings of Heaven upon me, and thanked me in your cathedral.

Bishop. Yes, General, and we feel the same sentiments of gratitude still, and ever shall pray for your welfare, and venerate you as the instrument used by God to save us from the worst calamities.

Gen. But the British forces are again arrived, and I am again called upon to do my duty. Why do I not find the members of your flock in my ranks?

Bishop. My dear General, they feel now as they did then. But there is a very material change of circumstances.

Gen. Will you not exhort them to support me—to protect their country—to fulfil the obligations which they have contracted with the government—to observe their oaths?

Bishop. Why really, General, I feel a little delicacy in doing so at present, and will take it as a great favour, if you will not press me to an explanation.

Gen. What can be your objection now? You have done so on a former occasion?

Bishop. Yes; my dear General, it is true I have then done so, but the circumstances were different from what they now are.

Gen. What is the difference? Is it not the same enemy? Have you not the same property to protect? Have you not the same motives for action?

Bishop. Yes, General; but have you not heard of the Proclamation of the Duke of Wellington? And of my having received a particular order to publish it to my flock?

Gen. What order? From whom?

Bishop. You seem to be a little moved; but, general, I must do my duty, and feel equally disposed to fulfil it, and you do to fulfil yours.

Gen. I desire no more: I am only come to request the performance of that duty; it is the duty of a bishop to exhort his flock to fulfil their obligations. Your flock are obliged to preserve that government which they have established, and contracted with, and which has fulfilled its part of the compact. It is their duty to defend their houses, and their families, and their country; and I request you will discharge your duty, in exhorting them to the discharge of theirs.

Bishop. But, General, seriously, did you not hear that Pope Leo XII. bestowed this country on his most sacred majesty, King George IV., and the Duke of Wellington is only come hither to take possession for King George IV.? I cannot oppose him.

Gen. Sir, you are a traitor. What has Pope Leo to do in this?

Bishop. I am no traitor. The Pope can give away kingdoms and republics too, and he has done so.

Gen. But the British will take your houses and property: you will be stript of all.

Bishop. We are aware of that, and have no remedy.

Gen. Will you not defend your property?

Bishop. God forbid. It would be a crime against our faith to keep a particle, because the Pope has given it all away.

Gen. But I am at a loss to know what right Pope Leo XII. has to bestow a place which never was his, and to transfer property which never belonged to him.

Bishop. Upon that there can be no question; for the editor of the *Missionary*, published at Mount Zion, in Hancock County, Georgia, has a good library, is an excellent critic, has made a critical examination, and has a tender conscience; and thus qualified, he has declared that the Pope possesses temporal power over all the goods and possessions of all Christians, to dispose of them as he pleases. Now, we have seen his bulls disposing of our goods and possessions to the British soldiers. We trust you do not mean to complete our misery by stripping us of the title of Christian, as his Holiness has stripped us of our goods and possessions. . We must sooner give up the goods of life, than those of eternity; we must not destroy our souls.

Gen. Well, do as you please with your goods and possessions, but you must defend the nation and its government.

Bishop. That is impossible, for the same learned Theban has taken upon his conscience to assure us, that this power of the Pope extends "even to the transferring of kingdoms from one to another:" and this has been transferred to King George.

Gen. But this is not a kingdom; this is a republic. The Pope cannot bestow this.

Bishop. That is a Jesuitical quibble: a vain distinction. His power must be construed widely, and favourable to him. The word kingdoms means any territory.

Gen. When Popes formerly made those transfers, it was not upon the plea of divine power inherent in them, but upon the plea of previous contract, of some kind or other. Between the Pope and us, there is no contract of this description, though he might have had the power formerly, in special cases upon those grounds. He has no such grounds as regards this Union; you must then defend it, or else——"

We acknowledge that we have taught the General much patience, and given him more words than he would be disposed to use. But, does any one imagine Bishop Dubourg would be the fool, the simpleton, this exhibition would designate? Yet, if the principle of the *Missionary* were true, such should be the language of the Bishop.

The proposition contains two parts; the first respecting the private property of individuals. Surely the *Missionary* could not believe Cath-

olics were bereft of every claim to reason; he could not believe it was a principle of theirs to consider themselves bound to act as he described. At all events, Napoleon, who styled himself the eldest son of the church, did not. We never met any individual who held the doctrine. We never saw any such in any doctrinal book. Pray, in what book or paper did the *Missionary* discover it? Will he favour us with information? If he do not, we shall feel ourselves called upon to bestow upon himself the full merit of the invention.

The second part of the proposition is also a misrepresentation. There is not, there was not a doctrine of the Catholic Church, "that the Pope had power to transfer kingdoms from one to another."

Thus both parts of the second proposition are untrue.

As to the fact of the transfer, and the ground upon which it was sometimes claimed, and sometimes exercised, we have given frequent explanation. It is not, it was not a doctrine of the church, that the Popes had the power: each case is to be explained by its peculiar circumstances; and, should any special cases be adduced, they shall receive special answers.

We shall continue our review.

SECTION IV.

We resume the review of the extraordinary propositions which have been set forth as articles of Catholic Faith.

In our last we had under review the very strange assertion "that the Pope possesses temporal power over all the goods and possessions of all Christians." We have seen some of the most extraordinary productions of writers, who, leaving common life, launched into the world of theory and gave us disquisitions which were a blending of mad metaphysics, and sublimated theology; very frequently there could be no contradiction to revelation found in those precious productions, though they were almost wholly a tissue of contradiction to common sense. To make our proposition intelligible, we cannot take a better example than what is now before us. A proposition may not be heresy, and yet be an absurdity. Heresy is the contradiction to revealed truth. Now there are many truths which are not revealed. The church claims no jurisdiction to examine the truth or falsehood of propositions except as they regard revelation. Thus were I to assert that a circle is a square, I contradict no revealed doctrine, I am guilty of no heresy, I do not come under the cognizance of an ecclesiastical tribunal. The book containing this proposition may be submitted to the congregation of car-

dinals with the usual quere, "does this work contain anything opposed to faith or to morality?" They certify, "we have perused and do not find anything opposed to faith or morals." Does it follow that the cardinals believe it to be a Catholic doctrine that a circle is a square? Does it follow that they believe a circle to be a square? By no means. But it does follow that they testify, that it has no opposition to faith, that is, that God has not revealed anything upon the subject; that it has no connexion with morality, that is, that no rule of moral conduct is influenced by the circumstance. This is all that the church has to do with the proposition.

But is it not absurd to say that a circle is a square? So a mathematician will tell you, so common sense will tell you. But surely you would not expect a decision upon the point from a Criminal Court, nor from a Civil Court; though you would look for it from a University. The church has as little to do with the question. The court never interferes with any questions of this sort. The ecclesiastical tribunals follow the same rule. Thus the sanction or approbation of a book by the ecclesiastical authority, is not a testimony that every proposition which it contains is true, nor that every proposition which it contains is Catholic doctrine, and part of the deposit of faith, or a sound principle of morality, but it is a testimony, that the book contains no erroneous doctrines as regards faith and morality; but it does not testify that there is no folly, no absurdity. To apply this principle: we doubt not but writers might be found who did go so far as to assert that the Pope had this power over property and kingdoms; we will even suppose that the books received the usual testimonial. What follows? Therefore it is a doctrine of the Catholic Church? By no means, but it follows, it is not a heresy; but yet it may be a falsehood, it may be an absurdity. And in fact it is an absurdity, and is not a Catholic doctrine. One of the misfortunes to which we are perpetually exposed, is, that we are assailed by persons "ignorant of our tenets," unacquainted with our customs and institutions, and who, with a peculiar self-sufficiency, tell us that because they have our books, and have critically read them, they know our doctrines better than we do.

It is not a Catholic doctrine, 1. That the Pope possesses temporal power over all the goods and possessions of all Christians, to dispose of them as he pleases, neither is it a heresy, but it is an absurdity. It is not a Catholic doctrine, 2. That the Pope possesses temporal power even to the transfering kingdoms from one to another, neither is it a heresy, but it is false and ridiculous. The special acts which took place are found to rest upon special grounds, not upon a general doctrine. When

any case shall be adduced we pledge ourselves to prove our assertion from history.

We now come to examine the third proposition:

"That the laws of the Pope are obligatory, and bind the consciences of all men."

This may be speedily dismissed. It is not true, for 1. No law of the Pope binds any person who is not subject to his jurisdiction. Now unbaptized persons are totally exempt from his jurisdiction, they constitute a majority of the human race, therefore even the most strenuous advocate for the greatest extent of Papal authority, must admit that no Papal law is obligatory upon or binds the conscience of the great majority of the human race. We may therefore dismiss this proposition with its mark—"False."

But though we shall not now enter on the disquisition, we go farther and assert, that although the Pope is the father and universal shepherd of Christians, there are very few cases in which he can make laws, and very few subjects upon which he can legislate, and that his powers in those cases are by no means arbitrary. His office has more of an executive than of a legislative character.

And again, his temporal laws bind only the people of those states of which he is a temporal governor.

The next proposition is,

"That the civil power ought to be united with the ecclesiastical—so that the Pope is not only a spiritual pastor, but a temporal prince."

The first part of this is totally false, and so far from being Catholic doctrine has something the appearance of heresy, though not absolutely heretical. The fact is that during the first ages of Christianity, the persons who had ecclesiastical power were persecuted by those who had civil power.—Yet no person called in question that St. Peter and the other Apostles had the full and complete authority which belonged to their order. When our blessed Lord gave to his disciples power and a kingdom, the power was not of things on earth, but of things in heaven "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." And again, "My kingdom is not of this world." The Church never held such a doctrine. At times she has seen her bishops, her abbots and other ministers raised by the emperors, or kings, or people, to temporal rule, but this gave no increase of spiritual power—and she has seen them hurled from their earthly dignities, and this did not strip them of the authority of the spiritual republic. Men can bestow or take away temporal power, for its origin and bestowal are in civil society; but spiritual authority must be derived from God, not from man, it must be bestowed according to the ordinance of Christ, not according to the caprice or the

dictation of the people. And the most dreaded of his predecessors had not more spiritual power than was possessed by Pius VII., when he was a captive to the despot of Europe, nor was the Irish Archbishop, whom a hangman strangled, and mangled for his religion at Tyburn, less in possession of his power, than was Becket or any Archbishop of Canterbury, who withstood the rapacious despotism of any British king.

It is no tenet of the Roman Catholic Church "that civil power ought to be united with the ecclesiastical."

The second part is but the statement of a fact insidiously and uncandidly put, "so that the Pope is not only a spiritual pastor but a temporal prince." Omit the words, so that, and we allow the fact, but the words are an insinuation that the Pope is a temporal prince, because it is a doctrine of our church that civil power ought to be united with ecclesiastical power. The whole proposition thus becomes a falsehood, though it is a fact that the Pope is a temporal prince and a spiritual pastor, because his temporal power does not arise from his spiritual authority.

There is not on earth a body of clergy who have uniformly endeavoured to create this union in their own person with more steady energy than those of one of the Protestant communions. The King is their church-head, their bishops are all members of the legislature, and their officiating ministers are generally the justices of the peace in their several districts.—And they are uniformly found united to continue the persecution of their fellow-subjects who differ from their church, and to restrain the enthusiasm of their flocks in favour of civil and religious liberty, and to preach that nothing would be more criminal than to dissolve the union of Church and State. And where they have had opportunities, as in several European countries, not to mention the early doings in New England, other Protestant clergymen have joined temporal power and domination to spiritual pastorship. Yet we have never charged them with holding the principle, because, though we could prove the fact, we knew it would be bad logic. We would recommend to the *Missionary* a small share of discretion on this and some other topics. As well might he argue that it is a principle of the Baptist or of the Presbyterian doctrine; we could give him facts enough without going out of America.

In his fifth proposition he proves that he does not know our tenets:

"That ecclesiastics are not subject in any respect to the laws of a temporal prince."

Never was a greater blunder—we call it blunder, because it is a gross mistake of law, history, canons, customs and facts. The special

exemptions of particular princes in particular nations for clergy, sometimes created special privileges; it does not follow that other clergy have similar privileges; every clergyman in the United States is subject to all the laws of the Union, and to all the laws of the State in which he resides. Some States give them special privileges. The enjoyment of the privileges, is a favour conferred, not an inherent right to the individuals or in the body. The Pope and councils have no power in this case. The sovereignty of the nation or of the state alone has power. But if the privileges be given, no person can complain that they are used.

If by a national compact, as frequently was the case, the clergy in times of petty tyranny and feudal strife were exempted from the laws made for the laity, and handed over to other tribunals than the ordinary courts, to be tried according to special laws by their own judges, and according to a peculiar mode: was it criminal in them to claim the benefit of the compact? Was it criminal in the officers of their courts to guard their rights? Was it criminal in both to plead the compact even against a despot? Or what analogy can there exist between such cases, and a case in America where no distinction exists, and all are amenable to the same tribunal; or what had this to do with doctrines of religion? O! that our missionaries would direct some of their critical acumen to the study of history, and not too hastily take upon trust what our enemies have written! they would make fewer blunders, and we should be spared much trouble.

We shall continue our review.

SECTION V.

The sixth proposition is that which amongst those which are false, perhaps bears most semblance to truth, yet it is not true, especially as found in the context of our Georgian friend:

> "The election of pastors they consider as belonging to bishops, but especially to the Pope—so that no one is acknowledged who has not been ordained by them to office."

Now, putting all ambiguity out of the way, we must divide this proposition into at least three parts. 1. Roman Catholics consider the election of pastors as belonging to bishops. 2. Roman Catholics consider the election of pastors as belonging principally to the Pope. 3. No one is acknowledged a pastor by Roman Catholics who has not been ordained by the bishops or Pope to office.

We shall first take the parts as they stand, and we shall then see what is the truth round which they thus blunder.

As to the first: *The Missionary* cannot know a particle of canon law, or he would never have made the assertion. It is really curious to see how error will cure error. The schismatics of St. Mary's Church of Philadelphia, in the plenitude of their wisdom, will tell you that the Roman Catholics do not consider the election of pastors to be in bishops, but the *Missionary* tells you Roman Catholics do consider the election of pastors to be in bishops; here, then, are two contradictory—no—we beg pardon, they are only two contrary propositions, and as a plain logical proof that they are only contrary, they are both false. Whoever has the right of patronage, has the election of the pastor. Now, vast numbers who are not bishops have this right. By certain provisions of the Council of Trent, this election to a cure of souls must, in many instances, follow the decision of sworn examiners, of whom only a part are appointed by the bishop. In other instances, Concordats have regulated; so that there are but some places where the bishops elect the pastor. If the *Missionary* confined his proposition to the United States, it would have answered all his purposes, and his assertion would have been true. But because he did not know his subject, he made a very serious mistake. Bishops do not elect to all offices of pastorship, nor in all places.

As to his second part of the proposition, it has less truth than the first. As to his third part, we really have no hesitation in saying, that Roman Catholics do not acknowledge any person to have been validly ordained except he has been ordained by a bishop. The Pope being a bishop, and as to order, having no higher character than any other bishop, is, of course, included.

Without entering into any argument upon the subject, for we only were to show that our doctrine has been misrepresented, not to defend its correctness, we then state the proposition not to be correct.

We may be allowed one remark, though we suspect our Georgian friend will doubt, and the Philadelphia folk will deny. The old mode of appointment to pastorship was, that not only were pastors ordained by bishops, but they were also elected by bishops, and we think in those places which have changed from that primitive custom, the change has been for the worse, and we think the canons which gave the right of lay-patronage are very bad, and we are sorry our Georgian writer's sixth proposition is false, we would much rather it were true; and though we differ from the principle of those canons, and lament their existence, still we are good Catholics and shall obey the said canons, and observe

them where they may happen to be applicable; just as we are good citizens and will observe the laws of the United States, though we do most heartily condemn the tariff bill of the last session.

"That the Pope is subject to no human tribunal—that he is superior to councils, and that he is infallible in the exercise of his authority."

Our *Missionary* seems quite fond of triple propositions, *numero impare gaudet*; however, it is a good sign, for it is emblematic of his partial othodoxy. We hail every good symptom. 1. The Pope is subject to no human tribunal. Now Pope Leo XII. is an independent sovereign; as such, we do not, we must confess, know to what tribunal on earth he is subject, for a sovereign is not a subject. As head of the church, we also admit that we do not know any human tribunal to which he is subject; for we do not count a general council to be a human tribunal, as though it be composed of human beings; it was constituted by God. 2. He is superior to councils. Pray, good *Missionary*, who authorized you to teach this doctrine? Not the Council of Constance. Pray, what council gave you authority to teach it? Now, it happens that we are good Roman Catholics, and most obsequious to his holiness, and one of our number has sworn a solemn oath to preserve the rights of the Pope, and yet, strange to tell, not one of us believes him to be superior to a general council, one whit more than we believe Mr. Monroe to be superior to the Congress. 3. And that he is infallible in the exercise of his authority! ! Why this is a jump beyond all the jumps we ever knew or heard of. Even our friend Frederick Butler, of whom, by the by, we have heard nothing yet, never made such a bounce. Aye, indeed, America is truly the land of liberty. Where people may tell as many . . . as they please, and the more boldly they tell them, the more likely they are to be believed. And pray, gentle *Missionary*, upon what ground do you attribute this doctrine to Roman Catholics? We have known some divines give as their opinion that the Pope under certain circumstances was infallible in giving his doctrinal decisions; just as the King of England can do no wrong; just as the Supreme Courts will infallibly give the true meaning of the laws. But never until the news reached us from Mount Zion—not in Judea, but the little one in Hancock County, did we know this doctrine of our faith; but we like it so little that we shall take the liberty of rudely rejecting it, for with the full assent of the Pope, we have thrice sworn that it was not an article of our faith, and that we were not by our faith bound to believe that the Pope was infallible, and we do pray the good, kind, sweet, critical, and well-informed *Missionary* not to drive us to perjury by making that

an article of our faith, which with the Pope's own consent we have sworn was not.

Then we are perjurers or the seventh proposition is false. O! criticism, thou art flown to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason. Really this criticism is but an *ignis fatuus* to lead people astray; a jack-o'-the-lanthorn to bring poor *Missionaries* into quagmires; and good libraries are a bewildering desert.

"That the sacred Scripture owes its authority to the church (i. e. the Pope), without whose testimony we should be no more bound to receive it than Livy or the Koran."

Roman Catholics, when asked what is the Church? answer, "the congregation of the faithful." The *Missionary* being asked "what is the Church?" answers, "the Pope," therefore the Pope is the congregation of the faithful, and of course the congregation of the faithful is the Pope. Really this is a new species of exhibition of his Holiness; formerly people were content to change his sex, to make him a harlot, to clothe him in a fine scarlet shawl, to give him ten horns, to make him sit upon seven hills, to call him a beast, to write 606 upon his forehead and to terrify big and little children in England and Scotland, and the British colonies with terrific stories about the wine of his abominations, and then abominate him for not giving any wine at all. But now the Pope is to be made up of several millions of men, women, and children, of all nations in the world. Indeed, indeed, we must be excused from believing this. Therefore the Pope is not the Church, nor is the Church the Pope. Now, what would our *Missionary* friend say to us, were we gravely to tell the whole world, "the doge of Venice was the Venetian republic." "Mr. James Monroe is bounded on the North by the British possessions, on the West by the Pacific Ocean and Mexico, on the South by Mexico and the Gulf of Mexico, and on the East by the Atlantic Ocean and New Brunswick, his extreme length is from East to West upwards of 2000 miles, and his breadth from North to South, is upwards of 1500 miles. He contains twenty-four states, and several territories, and is likewise inhabited by several tribes of Indians." Yet it would be just as correct to say that the United States is Mr. Monroe, as to say the church is the Pope. This vitiates the whole proposition.

We should feel ourselves indeed at some loss if we had not some person or persons to inform us of the authority of any book. We should not know what to say, for instance, if going into a strange country with a copy of the Holy Bible, we called upon a man and told him to listen to the word of God, and he should put the question to us, "How shall I know that what you read to me is the word of God," unless upon

the principle of having some witness or tribunal to testify that it is the word of God, and that testimony being sufficient to satisfy a rational being of the truth of the fact. We know not how this man could be asked to believe what was read to be God's word. Now who is the witness? What is the tribunal? We say, the Church, that is the congregation of the faithful, an undying, perpetual and still living body, in whose hand this book has always been, and who at first saw evidence of its being the word of God, and who has preserved the book and the evidence, and by its public tribunal gives me both the book and the testimony of its divine authority. Hence it is not to the Church the book owes its authority, but to God. The church gives no authority to the book, but it gives testimony to the book and to the authority. The witness who is known to be the proper officer of the legislative body, testifies that the legislature made a law; without his testimony the law has no force, but the law does not derive its authority from him, but from the legislature. God is our legislator in religion; the church is his witness, the authority emanates from God alone, the testimony from the church. If I had not testimony that God revealed the contents of the Scriptures, I would not be bound to receive the Scriptures as [a] revelation.

Pray, Mr. Missionary, who will testify to you living in Hancock County, Georgia, in the year 1824, that God Almighty revealed each and every proposition contained in the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, and that he did not reveal the doctrines contained in the second book of the Maccabees?

Now, sir, when you compare the doctrine of the Church with your proposition you will find that you did misrepresent it, 1. by stating that the Pope was the Church, and next by stating that we believed the sacred Scripture to owe its authority to the Church.

"That the church has a right to determine what are the articles of faith which should be believed."

The Church has no such power, for the Church and every member of the Church is obliged to believe every article of faith. He who would choose between doctrines revealed by God, which alone are articles of faith, is by us called a chooser, that is αιρετικος, which you may translate Heretic, if you prefer that word to the first, and they only who believe all the doctrines revealed by God, that is all articles of faith, are called faithful. We want testimony to know what God has revealed, and we obtain the testimony for the whole revelation in the same way that we do for the Scriptures, which are part of God's revelation.

"The decision of the Pope in matters of faith are infallible, for he cannot err."

This is no doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, it never was. See what we wrote upon the seventh proposition.

No wonder that the general body of the people should be deceived and under perfect mistake as to our tenets, when excellent critics with good libraries make such blunders.

SECTION VI.

Respecting the Pope, this gentleman's next proposition is,

"He is the interpreter of Scripture, and the arbiter of all controversies which may arise."

This proposition divides itself into two—1. The Pope is the interpreter of Scripture. Now we shall insert the Roman Catholic proposition, "I also admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy mother, the church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures." Thus it is the church which is the interpreter of the Scriptures; and we have before shown that the Pope is not the Church. But in order to remove all ambiguity from the subject, the creed explicitly adds, "neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." Thus it is plain that the first part of this proposition is not true.

Second—"The Pope is the arbiter of all controversies which may arise." We object to this only for its vagueness. In some controversies he has a right to judge, to determine, and to have his judgment executed. Is anarchy desirable? Is it an objection to our religion that we have tribunals for deciding controversies?

"No one of the laity is permitted to read the sacred Scriptures unless he shall have obtained leave of the bishop. The reason which they assign for this is their obscurity."

This is not true. Here we have another very pretty specimen of bad logic, if our friend has seen the decision upon which he founds his assertion. It only contains two sophisms blended into one bad result. "There were at this time special ordinances in particular places for a certain period. Therefore, says the *Missionary*, these were general regulations, to be observed everywhere, for ever." Protect us from such logic!! Shall we give a specimen—"In the days of King Edward the Sixth, and of Queen Elizabeth, the Protestant clergymen were forbidden to preach, on account of their ignorance, but they were ordered to read homilies which had been compiled principally by laymen, therefore no one of the Protestant clergy is ever permitted to preach. The

reason which they assign for this is their ignorance." One statement is quite as true as the other. If our Georgian friend will be satisfied with the last we shall not quarrel about the first.

What is the fact? There is no principle of our church which prohibits the laity from reading the Holy Scripture; but there is a principle which prevents both clergy and laity, from the wisest Pope to the humblest child, from giving new and arbtrary explanations of the sacred text—which confines them to that meaning which "has always been held." Sometimes persons did not confine themselves to this, but innovated upon doctrine, inventing new notions, and profaning and distorting the sacred volume; on such occasions but very seldom, temporary restrictions were placed upon the ignorant, but those special provisions for extraordinary cases are not the general law, to which they are an exception.

The obscurity of the Scriptures has been stated as a fact by other churches [and] by the Roman Catholic Church, for it has published the entire of the sacred volume and amongst the rest a passage which, in the Bible of King James of England, reads thus, "even as our beloved brother Paul, also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you, things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures unto their own destruction." (*II Peter*, chap. iii. v. 15, 16.) Those bishops who occasionally restrained the unsteady, did nothing more than was done by St. Peter when in the next verse he writes, "ye therefore beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness."

"Knowledge is, therefore, excluded from being the foundation of faith, and ignorance is considered as having a better title to be connected with faith."

The premises from which this is deduced being false, of course so is this conclusion false. We must, however, state that if we clearly knew anything it would be impossible for us to have faith concerning it, because the Apostle St. Paul tells us that faith is the evidence of things not seen, and that faith is lost as soon as the knowledge of vision commences; so that this unfortunate proposition taken one way is false in fact, and taken the other way it intimates a heresy, if contradiction to the *Epistle of St. Paul* be heresy—so much for critical examination.

"Implicit faith is highly recommended."

The truth or falsehood of this proposition depends upon its meaning; its meaning is to be discovered from the context. If it means that the Roman Catholic Church highly recommends belief of her doctrines

without examining or caring to know upon what ground that belief is to rest, and without having a rational motive for belief: in this meaning the proposition is false, because the Roman Catholic Church tells her children that their belief ought to be founded on rational and sufficient motives, and calls upon them to examine, and to know the ground of those motives.

"They define faith to be a general assent to all things revealed by God and proposed to us by the church, written or unwritten."

This is true. Faith is a belief of everything which God has revealed, and we are not bound to believe one proposition more than his revelation. Does the *Missionary* look upon this doctrine to be so radically erroneous, that he cannot acquit his conscience without bearing testimony against it? In the name of religion will he tell us that we are not bound to believe everything that God reveals? Can God reveal falsehood? Can God lead us into error? Why not then believe all his revelation. Whether it be written or not written, matters not; if God reveals it we look upon ourselves as bound to believe all that he teaches. We do not look upon ourselves [as] bound to believe one proposition more than his revelation, though all the Popes and Bishops and Councils should call upon us to believe; we are not bound to believe, it is not faith to believe anything but what God reveals; but faith binds us to believe all his revelation. This is our principle, by this we stand or fall—"and proposed to us by the Church," yes! provided it be revealed by God, we will believe it—not otherwise—the Church testifies to us the fact that God revealed it. We look upon her to be a competent witness; but we do not believe she has power to add one particle to the revelation of God.

"They maintain that there is no necessity of translating the Scriptures into other than the Latin tongue, which was consecrated on the cross."

Where in the name of wonder has this ridiculous assertion been invented? To us it is new—new and extraordinary; it is false in the whole and in all its parts. Now it is very strange that before the pretended Reformation of religion, Roman Catholics had translated the Scriptures into all the tongues of the several nations of the earth into which the church was spread, and all this whilst we are told they maintained that there was no necessity therefor. As to the ridiculous assertion that the Latin tongue was consecrated on the cross, to us it is as unintelligible as it is novel. Has the *Missionary* no better pointed weapon of attack. Why, even one of his own straws, which he would not throw in our way, would be more formidable than this delusive shred of gossamer.

"They assert that the Sacred Scriptures are imperfect, and do not contain

all things necessary to faith and practice, — which defect is supplied by traditions preserved in the Romish Church."

If this proposition means, as it appears to mean, that Roman Catholics undervalue the Scriptures, it is false. If it means that Roman Catholics believe the last verse which ever a divinely-inspired penman wrote, it is true. That verse, translated in the Protestant version, is the following: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." Now, will the *Missionary* testify against us for believing the last inspired line which was written? Does he supply nothing by tradition? Why does he keep the first day of the week holy, and break the Sabbath? However, we do not enter upon the argument. We only want to show his mistakes of what are Catholic tenets,—not what are his errors of belief.

"That there is no need of any argument besides tradition; so that all the innovations which they have made in the worship of God are supported by having recourse to traditions."

Untrue in all its parts,—no persons are more ready to argue from the Sacred Scriptures, and from sound philosophy; but where they meet persons who are so prejudiced that they would not believe even if one came from the dead, Catholics do not argue, and do not wish to converse upon points of difference with persons of this description, for the conversation could do no good, and might, and probably would, do much mischief by breach of charity and offensive language; to avoid which, a Catholic is always advised rather to leave the field to an obstinate, self-sufficient babbler, except on some very extraordinary occasions. Catholics deny that they have introduced any innovations into the worship of God; and one of the most frequent themes of reproach against them is, that they too slavishly follow their predecessors, and chain down the human mind from making new discoveries in revelation.

Thus, our friend, the *Missionary*, will perceive that Doctor England was not so very erroneous when he asserted at Warrenton, that the tenets of his religion were not well understood in Georgia; and we believe, after the exhibition which we have given, it is great charity to write, "the *Missionary* is totally ignorant of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church." If our friend does not like this proposition, he is quite welcome to the alternative.

SECTION VII.

Ecce iterum Crispinus!

This writer is again at work. In his paper of the 21st of June, he says, regarding Dr. England's sermon in Warrenton:

"That he is ready to redeem his promise, by submitting to any corrections which that learned prelate, or those who heard him, may think proper to make with respect to the sermon, and he would add, with respect to the accompanying remarks also. There might have been, in some parts of the Bishop's 'discourse, more semblance of reasoning than the folly to which he is made give utterance,' though we entirely disclaim any intention of having misrepresented the positions which he advanced; and we are the more confirmed in the general correctness of our statements, from the fact of having conversed with gentlemen who, the day before, heard the same sermon *verbatim et literatim*. But the Bishop must know better than we, as he doubtless has it in manuscript."

Respecting this we have only to say, Dr. England authorized our denial of the accuracy of the report in the *Missionary*, given as his sermon in Warrenton; and now authorizes us to add, that he did not write his discourse, and that the sermon which he preached on the previous day, or "the day before," was by no means similar to that which he preached in Warrenton. Though many of the topics were the same, yet the objects of the two discourses were altogether different. The topics, though, in many instances, relating the same facts, were differently treated; and that, upon the whole, nothing can have less foundation in truth than that his sermon in Washington was *verbatim et literatim* the same as that which he preached in Locust Grove church on the previous day. He tells us that, if he recollects rightly, he endeavoured to illustrate many of his positions in Warrenton by reference to the practice of the court of law in which he spoke, and by special allusion to his honour Judge Dooly, who sat next to him,—both which references and allusions would have been not only unintelligible, but absurd on the previous day, in a church where Judge Dooly did not preside, where no lawyers occupied places, and where the congregation consisted of persons who had frequently heard him preach, and to whom he could and did address himself in a very different manner from what he would to persons who he supposed had never seen or heard a Roman Catholic clergyman before.

But, independently of any assurance of the Bishop's, the *Missionary* himself has furnished us with the most convincing proof of his incapacity to report correctly.

This gentleman will not deny that he is better acquainted with the Protestant version of the Bible than he is with Doctor England's style of preaching. He must admit that he has read the Acts of the Apostles

much more frequently than he has heard the Bishop speak. Being also a great enemy to preferring oral tradition to Scripture, he will admit without any difficulty, that he could be more easily deceived in what he once heard, than in what he had often read in print, and we presume with deep attention. Yet in his paper of June 28, in an article remarking upon our review, he gives us, *in italics*, a solemn decision of the Apostles, which is at complete variance with the text of his own version, with the context of the chapter, with the facts that took place; and, in truth, he gives us one thing for another perfectly unlike and distinct therefrom.

He tells us of a decree which was passed in the Council of Jerusalem in the days of the Apostles, in which, amongst other things, the Gentiles were directed "to abstain from idols."

In the version which we presume he uses, the decree is in the words following: "*That ye abstain from meats offered to idols,*" and this is substantially the same in every other version, (*Acts* xv. 1-29.) We are not astonished that a gentleman who can make so gross a mistake as to say that the meat offered to an idol is an idol,—which is the same as to say that the glass of water which you offer to a thirsty man is the man himself,—should mistake the topics of a discourse which he heard only once, and which to him was a novelty.

Having now left between the Bishop and the *Missionary* to settle the fact as to who is correct, for there is between them a contradiction,—the *Missionary* saying, "this is your sermon of which, we suppose, you have the manuscript," and the Bishop saying, "it is not my sermon, and I have no manuscript, for I did not write,"—and having expressed our opinion that the Bishop is to be believed in preference to the *Missionary*, we come to a new topic.

The *Missionary*, instead of treating us in the manner that we act towards those whom we remark upon, acts in the way in which we have been uniformly accustomed to find every assailant of the Catholic doctrines or writers act. We always give at full length, and in their own words, the articles of our opponents. They uniformly garble, under pretence of wanting room. Thus, instead of giving our arguments or remarks, he selects four isolated passages as specimens of our vituperation—"viperine gall"—"sarcasms." Whilst he, good man, has no vituperation, though we happen to think the following short sentence more vituperative than all that we ever wrote:

"In speaking of the Roman Catholic Church, we may have been led astray by the 'falsehoods of unprincipled European writers,' yet we were reluctant to acknowledge ourselves so much the dupes of prejudice and credulity as to make no al-

lowance for the excitement under which controversies are conducted. We may have been unfortunate in the selection of our authorities, but we are not yet prepared to consider those men unprincipled who are guilty of no other crime than tearing the mask from vice, and exhibiting the loathsomeness of the Popish hierarchy as it has appeared in the Vatican, and in all its subordinate branches."

Now, did we ever use a more vituperative expression than "tearing the mask from vice, and exhibiting the loathsomeness of the Popish hierarchy, in the Vatican and all its subordinate branches?" This, we suppose, is what the *Missionary* calls meekness and forbearance, in an article complaining of our abuses of him, the aforesaid *Missionary*. Of course is was in the spirit of meekness and forbearance that, in his original article, he calls upon us "to confess our corruption," "not to throw a flimsy veil over our past deformities." It was in the spirit of meekness and forbearance that he told us "we usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, by impiously pretending to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity." That "their holinesses were the upholders of horrible institutions." All this was in such a spirit of meekness and forbearance as demanded our most humble gratitude. The truth is, gentlemen of this description have the abuse of Popery so perfectly grafted on them by habit, that offensive epithets are familiar in their mouths as household words. But they must, when they use them, expect a Rowland for their Oliver.

Now mark his argument, or rather his answer to our remarks:—

"We will remind the editor of the *Miscellany*, before we proceed to the consideration of his arguments, that he has widely mistaken the ground which we intended to occupy. We have only given those doctrines which have been peculiarly favourable to the existence and power of the Catholic Church—which have been advanced and supported at different periods of their history, and which are now believed by the populace in many Catholic countries. And we gave them in full view of the grounds which Catholics now take to wipe off the odium which has been affixed to their name, and of the solemn averments of their universities in opposition to the charges of Protestants."

Was there ever so miserable a subterfuge? "We did not say you held those errors, but those errors were favourable to the existence of your church." We do not give ourselves much credit for shrewdness, but we will say that when we found the guarded phraseology,—"have been peculiarly favourable," and so forth, in the original article, we knew its purport as clearly as we now do, but we knew the cunning which dictated the ambiguity would, like the sensitive plant, shrink as soon as it was touched, and we therefore gave full room for the writer to display himself as he has done. Then he knew these were not doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, but he published them in such a way as that the generality of readers would imagine they were its doctrines,

whilst he left himself a way of retreat by saying that he only gave them as what have been peculiarly favourable as sometimes advanced, though he knew they were solemnly disclaimed by the Catholic universities in answer to the charges of Protestants. We will without any hesitation, charge him with now avowing that he did charge us with holding doctrines which he knew we disclaimed.—Is he an honest man?

They who have read our remarks will know how to appreciate the value of his succeeding sentence:

"The palpable errors with which we were charged by the *Miscellany* in regard to sixteen of the propositions contained in our paper of April 12th, are not so much errors *in facto*, as they are with the meaning which they have in our context. It was the context that stung them. A Roman Catholic might have expressed all these propositions, and glossed them over, and been a good Roman Catholic still. If it had been a fault at all, they would have placed it where they have the breach of the seventh commandment—*inter minora crimina*. An instance of exquisite glossing is contained in one of the above extracts. 'We have known,' says the *Miscellany*, 'some divines give as their opinion, that the Pope, under certain circumstances, was infallible in giving his doctrinal decisions.' Now, in the name of common sense, how far does this differ from our own statement, that the Pope is considered infallible in the exercise of his authority. But common sense is out of the question. Its place is supplied by Jesuitical casuistry. The difference in the text is merely verbal. It is the context which is branded with heresy. We will now give the gloss and leave the asterisks to themselves. The Pope is 'infallible in giving his doctrinal decisions; just as the king of England can do no wrong; just as the supreme courts will infallibly give the true meaning of the laws.' Excellent! !"

Again, we ask, is this man honest?—He proceeds:

"He would now ask the editor of the *Miscellany* a very civil question, viz., If those good divines whom he knows, are always careful that the context should accompany the text, so that the ignorant multitude might not mistake its import? we mean those who are as ignorant as he makes the good people of Georgia to be with regard to the Catholic faith."

We answer, they are much more honest than you are, for they do not write and publish what they know to have been falsely imputed to and disclaimed by those upon whom it is charged. They write what they think, and they also acknowledge it is only an opinion, it is not an article of Faith. They are honest, and do not, as you acknowledge yourself to have done, so write that truth might possibly be dug out of the words, whilst deceit and falsehood shadow the surface. He proceeds—

"By this time we begin to think that one point is gained, and that is, *The Pope is not infallible*; In other words, that *The Pope is fallible*. But the Pope is a bishop possessing powers superior to other bishops, yet he is fallible in giving his doctrinal decisions. A certain number of bishops assembled by proper authority, compose a General Council. As the Pope is a bishop and fallible, therefore a bishop is fallible, a General Council must be fallible, because it is composed of a number of fallible bishops; and what is true of each in their individual, is true of the whole in their corporate capacity. He, then, who could thrice swear that the Pope was

not infallible, might with equal safety swear as often that General Councils were not infallible."

We will swear that one pound weight will not be sufficient ballast for a ship, but we will not swear that an accumulation of many hundred pounds weight will not be sufficient for her ballast. We would swear that one juror's declaration of guilty, will not be sufficient to convict a man, even in Warrenton court-house. Yet will we not swear with equal certainty, that twelve jurors could not give a verdict. Thus, it is true, we believe, that our Lord did not make the decision of any one bishop infallible; but it does not follow, that we could and ought to swear, that he did not therefore establish an infallible tribunal. One member of a legislature, not even its president, is competent to the duties of the body, will it follow, as a matter of course, that the body cannot do its duty because it consists of several individual members? Admirable logic! What an honest man!

He proceeds—

"Yet the editor of the *Miscellany* meets us with a challenge that shows us our liability to 'mistakes, or something worse.' 'Produce,' he says, 'one general council of the Roman Catholic Church which has reversed the decision of another general council of the Roman Catholic Church, upon an article of faith, and we will abjure the Roman Catholic religion.' Individuals therefore can err — General Councils cannot, on an Article of Faith. This appears to be an old challenge, which they gave to the *Unitarian Miscellany*; and whether it has been accepted or not, we remain uninformed.

"We do not now mean to be considered as taking up the glove when we remind them of a decree that was passed in the council at Jerusalem, in the days of the Apostles, in which, among other things, the Gentiles were directed to abstain from idols. How does this, we would ask, comport with the canonization of saints, with bowing to the cross—with praying to the Virgin—with the sacrifice of the Mass—with deifying the bread and the wine in the sacrament, and worshipping it, literally worshipping the bread and the wine. The prayer of consecration changes not its properties. Analyze it, it is bread and wine still. Apply any test you please, it is precisely the same after, that it was before the consecration. All this appears to us very much like reversing a decree of that council which was held under the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit."

He has not given the decree correctly, nor has he produced the decree which contradicts it. Thus he has not performed either part of the requisition.

We feel, however, that he has at least given us one true statement, so that we entertain hopes of his improvement—he does acknowledge that the council of the Apostles was a general council of the Roman Catholic Church—so far we agree.

He gives notice—"We shall continue our remarks."

We shall continue our answers.

SECTION VIII.

We have, it seems, caught a Tartar! Wo be to us, the day our evil genius led us to attack Mount Zion. Alas! that we ever took the word of Dr. England for his not having preached what it was said he did! Better would it have been for us that our pen refused to bestow ink upon our paper, when we ventured to write the word *Missionary*—for we, are, now indeed, laid prostrate, as we have provoked the valiant to smite our miserable church.

THE CATHOLIC MISCELLANY.

"The following article is copied from the *Catholic Miscellany*, of May 19th, and is referred to by the editor of that paper, as a triumphant answer to the sophistry with which Catholics are charged in proving the infallibility of the church from the Scriptures, and the Scriptures, from the infallibility of the church. We copy it not so much for the purpose of questioning the logic, as to show its utter inconsistency with their other arguments. A simple denial of the charge would amply supply the place of all the verbosity."[74]

Then follows, fairly set forth at full length, our article under the head *Bad Logic*, in pages 307, 308, 309 [Vol. II. p. 210]; after which the *Missionary* continues:—

"We shall neither say that Dr. Watts was very ignorant of the manner in which Catholics argue, nor very ignorant of what is meant by the sophism of a vicious circle, nor a dishonest man who deceived his pupils and bore false testimony against the best and most numerous, and most enlightened society in the whole world. We shall neither impute to him nor take to ourselves any part of this good disjunctive proposition, but will produce testimony from their own lips to support the charge.

"As we have to deal with logical men, it becomes necessary at the commencement, to define terms. 'A vicious circle is when two propositions equally uncertain, are used to prove each other.' So says Dr. Watts. What logic is that by which the authority of the Pope is proved from the Scriptures, and the Scriptures from the authority of the Pope? no logic, or bad logic. — So says the *Miscellany*, page 328.

"We will leave his first and second cases entirely out of the question, because they have nothing to do with it. What the *Miscellany's* object was in introducing them, we cannot divine, unless he meant to place them in front, as a kind of screen, behind which he might the more effectually practice his sophistry.

"Before we take the third case into consideration, we shall introduce the testimony which we promised; and it is from the *Miscellany* of June 16, pages 372, 373 [Sup. p. 292].

"We should feel ourselves indeed at some loss if we had not some person or persons to inform us of the authority of any book. We should not know what to say, for instance, if going into a strange country with a copy of the Holy Bible, we called upon a man and told him to listen to the word of God, and he should put the question to us, 'How shall I know that what you read to me is the word of God,' unless upon the principle of having some witness or tribunal to testify that it is the word of God, and that testimony being sufficient to satisfy a rational being

[74] From the *Missionary* of July 5th.

of the truth of the fact. We know not how this man could be asked to believe what was read to be God's word. Now, who is the witness? What is the tribunal? We say, the church, that is the congregation of the faithful, an undying, perpetual, and still living body, in whose hand this book has always been, and who at first saw evidence of its being the word of God, and who has preserved the book and the evidence, and by its public tribunal gives me both the book and the testimony of its divine authority.

"The testimony is now before us. Dr. Watts and his imitators, (if he will have it so) say that Catholics argue in a vicious circle, as it respects the cases in question. The *Miscellany* says they do not. Let us apply the proof; and in doing this we will reduce it into several propositions.

"1. The *Miscellany* would be at some loss if he had not some person or persons to inform him of the authority of any book.

"2. He would not know what to say in a strange country, with a copy of the Holy Bible, if any one questioned its authority, unless he had some witness or tribunal to testify that it was the word of God.

"3. The church is this witness or tribunal, an undying, perpetual, and still living body, aye, and infallible too, in its doctrinal decisions.

"Here let it be remembered, he is in a strange country. He has the Holy Bible. The persons to whom he would commend it as the word of God, believe neither in the infallibility of the church nor in the authority of the Scriptures. This answers precisely to case 3. What is the poor Papist to do? He can do as much as the Protestants can, and make use of the same arguments. But still he is at a loss. The authority of the Scriptures is questioned, and he appeals to the testimony of the church, and the testimony of the church is questioned too. One questionable proposition is proved by another. O, logic! thou hast flown to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason.

"If this is not a vicious circle, we must confess that we are very ignorant of what is meant by the sophism of a vicious circle. Dr. Watts was right when he said that 'Papists proved the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of their church;' and this example fully proves that it is no '*dictum* of the schools.' He was right also in saying, that they 'then prove the infallibility of their church from the authority of the Scriptures.' Catholics will sometimes let their true sentiments leak out in spite of them.

"No doubt the editor of the *Miscellany* considers Protestants in a sad dilemma, when called upon to prove the authority of those Scriptures which they acknowledge as divine, inasmuch as they do not appeal to the infallible testimony of the holy mother. We receive the Epistle of Paul to the Romans as a part of Divine Revelation. At the same time we do not consider the 2d book of Maccabees entitled to a place in the canon of the Scriptures. We have testimony enough to admit the former and reject the latter, without consulting the tribunal to which he refers. Nor will the scurrilous language of this hopeful son of the church have the least tendency to convince us that they only have the keys of wisdom and knowledge, and heaven."

Now the charge against us is, that we have been guilty of the sophism in our article above quoted from page 292. We complain first that he has garbled our second article by stopping short in the middle of the paragraph. The very next line, if he gave it, would have de-

feated his dishonest purpose—"Hence it is not to the church the book owes its authority, but to God." This was the very next line, and this line is suppressed by the *Missionary*, and the man who read this line and who suppresses it, tells his readers who have no opportunity of seeing our article, that we teach that it is to the church, and not to God, the Scriptures owe their authority. The garbled piece which he gives does not convey the meaning of our article.

Secondly, he not only suppresses what we wrote, but he, in his distribution of our topics, under the head, 3, inserts what we neither wrote nor insinuated, viz.: "aye, and infallible too, in its doctrinal decisions." Here is then the suppression of what we did write and which contradicts the meaning imputed to us, and the suggestion of what we did not write, and which suggestion gives to the paraghaph a meaning which it has not.

Here is double dishonesty, 1, the suppression of truth, 2, the suggestion of falsehood.

Thirdly, even garbled as it is, this it not the sophism of a vicious circle. The article goes to say that by the testimony of an undying, perpetual, still living body, we may have evidence that God revealed the contents of a certain book. The article says, the church is that undying, perpetual, still living body, but the article does not assume that the church is infallible—therefore the article does not proceed to prove the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of the church. Nor does the article undertake to prove the infallibility of the church by the Scriptures, nor by any other means, nor to prove it at all. Therefore the article does not prove the infallibility of the church by the Scriptures, and the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of the church, both which it should have attempted, to be guilty of the sophism of a vicious circle.

The *Missionary* is very welcome to the designation which he gives himself, and we feel happy that we can again find some points of union in opinion.

The remaining part of the article is about half a column in brevier, of Latin quotations from a Greek father, Latin quotations from one or two Latin fathers, and his own English, all in dreadful array against an invisible enemy, yclept infallibility, which he can nowhere discover, and yet fights most manfully. As we wish to quit our old arrears, we shall lay aside this for the present, and not enter the lists against our friends until we shall have recovered from the bruises under which we so lamentably suffer. We have been severely beaten with scurrilous language, by some meek and forbearing *Missionary*, because we are

hopeful sons of the church. Alas, the day that we roused the ire of this compeer of Samson!

SECTION IX.

Our readers must excuse us for occupying so much of their paper with the very unsubstantial extracts which we are obliged to make from this publication; but we cannot depart from a principle which we consider as the only correct foundation of fair controversy; let both sides be heard. We will not imitate the conduct of our adversaries, by withholding from our readers what is written against our statements. We will not do as the *Missionary* does, who promised to insert any remarks in reply, when he made his original charges; and when a reply was furnished, withheld it. Who publishes for the edification of his readers, comments upon arguments which they cannot see except through his publication; whilst he suppresses the arguments, and sets up his misrepresentations, for every garbling is misrepresentation. Yet this man, who avowed that he gave as our doctrines what he knew we disclaimed, now when we disclaim those doctrines, persists in saying that they are our doctrines. Thus, this meek and forbearing *Missionary* tells us plainly that *we are lying hypocrites.* In fact, because he knows that it would not suit his purpose to say honestly—"I did believe you held those doctrines. I am glad to find you do not;" he expects us to submit to being forced by him to believe them, whether we will or not.

We beg our readers to recollect the true state of the question. On Monday, April 5, the Bishop of this diocess preached a sermon in the Court-House of Warrenton, Georgia, in which there was not a syllable that could or did give offence, nor a remark upon the tenets or practice of any other division of Christians. But he did complain that the people of Georgia were not correctly informed as to the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church; and grounded this statement upon his own knowledge of those tenets, and his acquaintance with many respectable persons of other denominations, who told him what they imagined to be Catholic doctrines: he stated that what they imagined to be the doctrine of his church was not its doctrine; and that if it was, he would not belong to the church, because those doctrines were evidently opposed to the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ. He added that he could not blame the Protestants of Georgia for imputing to Catholics those doctrines, because their opportunities of knowing what Catholics taught were very limited, and the books which professed to inform them upon the subject were filled with gross misrepresentations; that the blame of this misrepresentation could

not rest upon the people of Georgia, who had read books, with a desire of being informed, but ought to attach to the persons who, at the other side of the Atlantic, framed the misrepresentations, and transmitted them hither. He then entered into an explanation of some of the doctrines which had been so misrepresented.

One would imagine that Bishop England ought to know the doctrines of his own church, and that it would be no crime for him to say to those who read books in which those doctrines were misrepresented, these are not the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.

On the next Monday, the editor of a paper called the *Missionary*, published what he called an outline of the sermon. Dr. England authorized us to say that this outline was very incorrect; and we have proved very clearly, that even if he desired to give a fair report, the editor was incompetent to the task. One would imagine that when three or four sentences of pure nonsense upon the subject of miracles, were attributed in a public print to a bishop, it would be no crime for him to assert that the nonsense was not spoken by him, when he felt conscious that he could truly disclaim it. Now we will select but one phrase, and ask any person who knows Dr. England, whether he would believe him capable of using the following, or any similar expression: "But we cannot comprehend a miracle." We believe the Bishop can and does comprehend that Lazarus was dead, and was raised to life. We believe he can and does conprehend that Mrs. Mattingly was sick, and was instantly restored to health. Thus, he can comprehend a miracle; and if he did not comprehend a miracle, he could not believe that a miracle was ever wrought; and if he did not believe that miracles were wrought, he could not be a Christian, because the evidence of the truth of revelation is founded upon the fact that miracles were wrought. We can very well believe Dr. England to have said, that "we cannot know the manner in which the miraculous effect is produced;" but to believe the fact, it is not necessary to have more than evidence of the fact: there is no necessity of having evidence of the manner in which that fact came to exist. If I find the dead body of a friend or relative, I have sufficient evidence of the death, though I should never be able to discover the manner of that death. However, the distinction between the fact and the manner will probably be put down *barefaced quibbling* by a meek and forbearing *Missionary*, who could see no difference between a piece of meat which is offered to an idol, and the idol itself.

Had the editor confined himself to this, we might have attributed it to incompetency, and passed him over in silence—but, no, the *Missionary* gravely tells Dr. England, "sir, we have books written by your

own authors, which tells us your doctrines;" and he then publishes eighteen propositions as the result of his study: yet we know he avows that those doctrines were disclaimed by the Catholic universities. He, therefore, with a species of cunning and duplicity characteristic of a certain description of persons, prints those propositions as peculiarly favourable to the existence and power of the Catholic Church. If they were our doctrines, why not openly charge us with holding them? If they were not, why adduce them? This, we suppose, was not *barefaced quibbling*. We denied that they were the doctrines of our church, with one exception. Now one would imagine that even *an obscure Catholic in Charleston* ought to know the doctrines of his church better than a meek and forbearing *Missionary* of some other religion in Georgia. When we use the phrase some other religion, we mean no disrespect, but we merely mean to state, that as yet we have not the honour of knowing the name, and of course not the religion of our opponent; neither do we desire it, nor is it necessary.

Thus, we did not provoke this controversy, nor did we make any assault upon any individual, or body, or sect; but at the request of the Bishop, we stated that he did not preach nonsense; and from our own knowledge of our doctrines, we stated that the propositions published in the *Missionary* were not our doctrines, and we accompanied this denial with remarks upon each proposition, to prove that it was not our doctrine. We in several instances exhibited our doctrines, to show by the contrast that those propositions were incompatible therewith.

The *Missionary* did more—he in good round terms told the Bishop that he attempted to deceive the people at Warrenton; for he tells the public that the Bishop stated that the Inquisition was no part of the Catholic religion; and then, after appearing to compliment the Bishop, by a sort of acquiescence, "for argument's sake we will admit it," he proceeds to show that it was, and that "it owed its origin to the Catholic Church."

He insinuated that the Bishop said "the doctrine of indulgence was never a doctrine of the church." We cannot blame the man who imagines every distinction except his own to be barefaced quibbling, to see no distinction between a doctrine and its abuse. These are but a very few of the misrepresentations of which we had to complain. We gave them the name of mistakes, or worse, until the *Missionary* himself assured us that there was no mistake, that he knew that they were disclaimed by our universities; but still that he would say they were ours. We would remind him of the test mentioned in the third chapter of the first book of *Kings*, as marked in his Bible, or third book of

Kings, according to the Roman Catholic Church. His anxiety for the integrity of those propositions will prove their parentage; for our parts, we are content that just as they have been stated they be dissected and anathematized.

But we desire it to be remembered that we are still on the defensive, and in a very restricted manner. The *Missionary* has assailed and ridiculed many of our doctrines; to prove this we have not replied, for we wish, if possible, to avoid polemics; but when he says we teach what we do not teach, we must deny the imputation, and give our reasons for the denial.

We now lay before our readers the first proposition, which as a doctrinal one we disclaimed:

"1. That the government of the church is monarchical, and that the Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all other churches, and over all ecclesiastics."

Now we entreat our readers to turn to section iii., page 284, and to read our remarks, and then look at the *Missionary's* answer:

"This proposition the *Miscellany* has divided into three parts. '1. The government of the church is monarchical. 2. The Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all other churches. 3. The Bishops of Rome are invested with supreme power over all ecclesiastics;' and has spread his arguments over more than three pages, to prove that 'in each of its parts and in the whole, the proposition number one is a misrepresentation of the Roman Catholic doctrine.'

"He commences with his accustomed logical acuteness, by defining his terms. 'Monarchy,' he says, 'is where the power of governing is completely and solely in an individual; and no government is properly monarchical where there is a restraint upon the individual who is said to govern. The derivation of the word will clearly show its meaning μονος sole, and αρκη government.' This is the foundation upon which his argument is principally built. Now who would grant him the premises, without granting him also the conclusion?

"It is always considered unfair in reasoning, to use words out of their common and general acceptation. It betrays also a captious spirit and a weak cause. If we go to the root of many of the words incorporated in the English language, we shall find that in many instances there is scarcely a shadow of correspondence between the primitives and derivatives. The word monarchy, though not so suitable as some that might be selected, is yet sufficiently so to illustrate our meaning. Its primitive signification the *Miscellany* has given. But in this sense it can apply to no mortal under heaven. If monarchy is where the power of governing is completely and solely in an individual, who but God has that power in its full extent? And as the Pope is *Vicarius Dei generalis in terris* — the Vicar-general of God on the earth, pray where was the harm in calling him a monarch? If we believed that *dictum*, we should indeed go further than the *Miscellany* acknowledges Bellarmine to have gone, who said that the government of the church, '*praecipue monarchicum esse debeat*,' ought to be chiefly monarchical, and say, that it was monarchical in the fullest extent of the term. But the power of the Pope 'extends to all persons, to all places, but not to all acts; therefore he is not a monarch of the church.' The same argument would

prove that the government of Great Britain is not a monarchy, because the power of the king is limited, and that there never was, and never can be a monarchy upon the earth, because it is impossible for the power of one man to extend to all acts. The government of the church, the *Miscellany* says, is 'not an oligarchy,' nor 'an aristocracy;' and he might have said it was not a democracy. What is it then? 'A mixed government,' with a visible head, who 'has the primacy of honour and jurisdiction;' who has more extensive power in every diocess in the whole world than any other person — who has the highest titles that ever mortal claimed, and whose official acts plainly show that his titles are not an empty name, but armed with power: such a government as this we call monarchical. And we do verily believe that there would have been no objection to the term, had it been popular in this country. The second and third clauses of the proposition, he considers either true or false, according to the boundaries within which the supreme power is circumscribed. He objects to them because they are extremely vague. 'But taking them to have meaning in accordance with the other propositions, or even with the first clause of this same proposition,' they are he says, contradictions to their doctrine.

"This appears about as barefaced quibbling as we commonly meet with. Define supreme, dear sir, by the same rule that you did monarchy. But it will not answer your purpose. Why? You have been attempting to prove that the power of the Pope is limited, and this would render him unlimited. For his titles all tend to this very point. He is supreme prophet, priest, and king. His supremacy no Catholic denies. It is with them the very foundation of ecclesiastical government. But none can be supreme who is under any restraint. Tell us now, upon the profundity of your logical powers, within what limits you will confine his supremacy, and we will tell how far his powers extend as a monarch. What powers Pope Leo XII. may now have, we cannot tell, but the time has been when his predecessors have exercised an unlimited sway. You say that the governor of this state has more extensive constitutional power in Georgia than the Pope in the Roman Catholic Church. But what are the constitutional powers of the Pope? Your doctors disagree about them, as can be abundantly shown; and creeds equally orthodox can be found, which are directly opposed to each other on the limits of his power. We venture to say, there is no article in the Roman Catholic Church which expressly defines his powers. His subjects can call him '*Dominum Deum Papam,*'—the Lord God the Pope—or consider him inferior to councils, and be good Roman Catholics still. But it has been this supremacy of the Pope — this monarchical form of church government, which has been peculiarly favourable to Popery. An obscure Catholic in Charleston need not think that the people of the United States will believe him any sooner, than what he is pleased to call, the vile press of Europe. His single testimony will scarcely counterbalance the cloud of witnesses with which we are surrounded."

Upon all this we need write but little, and we shall confine ourselves to a correction of errors—mistakes or worse.

The writer asserts it to be a *dictum*, that is a recognised maxim of our schools, that the Pope is *Vicarius Dei generalis in terris*, the vicar general of God on earth. There is no such *dictum*. We never before heard the title given to him.

The writer asserts that the Pope is by Catholics considered supreme

Prophet, Priest and King. This is not true, no Roman Catholic looks upon the Pope to be a prophet or a king. They do believe him to be the supremè priest.

The writer says that none can be supreme who is under any restraint. The fact that there are many regulated and restrained supremacies shows his principle to be untrue. Reader look to our remarks page 286, col. 2, near the top, and we ask, would an honest man who had read that passage, to which this affects to be an answer, write what the *Missionary* has written?

He is at a loss to know what powers Pope Leo XII. claims at present, and what power Roman Catholics admit in him.

We answer, Pope Leo XII. has all the spiritual and ecclesiastical power that any of his predecessors ever had, and all the temporal power which the customs or constitution of the States of the Church vest in their sovereign.

He says our doctors disagree about the constitutional powers of the Pope and he ventures to say that there is no article in the Roman Catholic Church that expressly defines his powers. A gentleman who knows our religion better than it is known by our bishops needs no information from an obscure Catholic in Charleston. We shall not therefore undertake to gratify the curiosity of this mighty Fadladeen, and shall be fully content to know that he has ventured out of his depth, and as he would not throw a straw in our way, neither shall we throw a straw to a drowning man. Though we do assure him that he here makes not a little mistake.

He asserts, upon the authority of Babington, as he says, that the Pope's subjects call him *Dominum Deum Papam*, "the Lord God the Pope." Now, not having the honour of knowing Mr. Babington, we can say nothing of him, but if some good witness would join in testifying with the *Missionary* that there was a Mr. Babington who did make such a statement, we would then believe that Mr. Babington had stated a notorious falsehood. We certainly did find the statements in a little book purporting to have been compiled by Frederick Butler, A.M. But notwithstanding our proclamation to discover whether the said Frederick was a true and real being, we have not been as yet able to find whether he only existed upon paper or lived in the flesh and used substantial food. So also we say of Mr. Babington. But of the statement we say it is a falsehood; not the more excusable for its containing blasphemy.

The article proceeds to examine our remarks upon the second and third propositions, which examination we could, upon the system of the

Missionary, despatch in about ten lines, but we will not treat even him with injustice.

SECTION X.

We again entreat the pardon of our readers for the insertion of a long and vapid extract from the *Missionary*. Remarking upon our examination of his second proposition, he goes on as follows:

"But what in the name of common sense," says the *Miscellany*, "are we to do with the next?"

2. That the Pope possesses temporal power over all the goods and possessions of all Christians, to dispose of them as he pleases, even to the transferring of kingdoms from one to another.

This appears to afford him no little amusement; and in attempting to be witty, we are satisfied that he is no more than "Nature's journeyman" at the trade. We will permit him to laugh at his own dialogue between Dr. Dubourg and Old Hickory, till he is fat—and that he may laugh still more heartily, we will throw him another crumb, compounded of his own inconsistencies. One week, he says, with regard to the first part of this proposition, "Pray, in what book or paper did the *Missionary* discover it? Will he favour us with the information? If he do not, we shall feel ourselves called upon to bestow upon him the full merit of the invention." Really! He must think us now at our wit's end to know which horn of the dilemma is most prudent to take. But before we make the selection, we will give him the precious morsel which we promised. In his next paper, after a week's reflection, he says, "We doubt not but (Roman Catholic) writers might be found who did go so far as to assert that the Pope had this power over property and kingdoms. We will even suppose the books received the usual testimonial. What follows?" It follows that it was no invention of the *Missionary*. It follows that man is unprincipled who would fasten the lie upon one whom he knows to be innocent. It follows that the arrogant pretensions of the Popes have been abetted by servile flatterers, and they have owed their awful elevation to means which they are at present ashamed to avow. So much for the *Miscellany's* consistency.

We should now like to be informed if Innocent III., claimed no temporal jurisdiction over the liberties and property of Christians, even to the disposing of kingdoms, when he absolved the subjects of John of England from their allegiance, and offered to Philip of France, "the remission of all sins, endless spiritual benefits, and the property and possession of the kingdom of England," as the reward for his labour in collecting an army for the purpose of invading and conquering that country? — Or if no temporal jurisdiction was claimed when this same John was compelled to acknowledge the supremacy of the Holy See and resign "England and Ireland to God, to St. Peter and St. Paul, and to Pope Innocent and his successors in the Apostolic chair," and to hold his dominion as feudatory of the Church of Rome by the annual payment of a thousand marks? Or if no temporal power was claimed by the Pope when the Barons of England invited the French King to interfere, and save their lives and property from the tyranny of John and the Church? Did he not threaten Philip with excommunication if he invaded the patri-

mony of St. Peter, or attacked a prince who was under the immediate protection of the Holy See?

It is needless to multiply cases, for the *Miscellany* tells us that "each case is to be explained by its peculiar circumstances," and that "should any special cases be adduced, they shall receive special answers." But what peculiar circumstances can render the conduct of the Popes compatible with that declaration of our Saviour, who said, "My kingdom is not of this world," we are perfectly at a loss to conjecture.

Although the *Miscellany* has denied this proposition to be Catholic doctrine, yet he has not branded it with "heresy," and well for him that he has spared it this odious epithet, for on that ground we should be capable of showing that many heretics have occupied the Papal Chair, and many are honoured with a place in the Calendar.

There is a mystery hanging around Catholic doctrine which renders it very similar to those oracles which give an ambiguous response. Some consider it embraced in the canons of the Council of Trent. — Others are of a different opinion. Dezius, a Jesuit of Strasburg, wrote a book expressly to prove that there was little or no difference between the doctrine of the Council of Trent, and that of the Augsburg confession; than which no two systems can be more irreconcilably opposite. The celebrated *Exposition of the Roman Catholic Faith*, by Bossuet, was condemned by the University of Louvain, and declared to be scandalous and pernicious. The Sorbonne also disavowed its doctrines; but by a late edict, the fathers of that seminary, we are told, have changed their opinion. Clement X. refused his sanction to the book, positively; yet it obtained the Pope's approbation after a period of nine years; probably after having undergone some alterations. It is no evidence of Catholic doctrine that a book has "received the usual testimonials" of their Church. It may contain many absurdities and "false and ridiculous" notions, and be approved too. They have a leaden rule which they can easily bend to measure any work that they wish to approve or reject. This rule we have disregarded; and as we have found in Catholic books those doctrines which we have considered as having been favourable to Popery, and in Catholic practice a confirmation of them, they will excuse us for having exposed them to light.

We now come to the third proposition:

That the laws of the Pope are obligatory, and bind the consciences of all men.

This he has speedily dismissed with "its mark — False," after playing awhile upon the word all. When we wrote it, we did not consider our consciences in the least bound by the Pope, or that his jurisdiction was acknowledged by every individual in the whole world, though his title of Vicar-General of God upon the earth, looks a little like claiming universal dominion. — When such petty quibbles as these are introduced, men of sense will conclude that they have not solid arguments on hand.

We now ask is this an answer to our denial? We denied that it was an article of Catholic Faith, that the Pope possessed temporal authority over all the possessions, and so forth.

How does he prove that it is an article of faith in our church, that the Pope possesses such authority?

He says first, that we stated in our paper section 10, page 288, column 2, near the bottom "We doubt not but (Roman Catholic) writ-

ers might be found who did go so far, as to assert that the Pope had this power over property and kingdoms, we will even suppose the books received the usual testimonial. What follows?"

Now we charge him again with inserting words which we did not write. It is that finding himself so often exposed, and perhaps wishing to regain some character, he has inserted his interpolation between crotchets, (Roman Catholic.)

Again, we charge him with suppressing what we did write, and with substituting a false conclusion for that which he omitted. After the words "what follows," we added, "Therefore it is a doctrine of the Catholic Church. By no means; but it follows that it is not a heresy, but yet it may be a falsehood; it may be an absurdity. And in fact it is an absurdity, and is not Catholic doctrine." Would an honest man have thus shamefully garbled? But he is satisfied, for his readers do not see our statements. The Catholics, whom their clergy wish to keep in ignorance, have both sides fairly placed before them. The *Missionary* never gives a quotation without being garbled and having its meaning perverted.

The case of Innocent III. is brought forward. To this we answer, that when the writer in the *Gospel Advocate* adduced the same, we then answered it in pages 205, 206, 213, and 214, of Volume I., and we are not disposed to fill our columns with repetitions. This reference will suffice for those who read the *Miscellany*. The *Missionary* would keep his readers from seeing our answers, so that to write for them would be useless, and they would never see it. From the explanations we there gave, it is manifest that the Pope's claim was not founded upon doctrine of the church, but upon what was then the law of nations. To show his claim, is not to show his possession of the right to what he claimed.

We are greatly mistaken if the *Missionary* has not quoted from Hume. Now Hume, in his account of the reign of Henry II., the father of John, informs us that Henry applied to the Pope as his superior lord, to excommunicate his enemies. Every historian knows that Henry acknowledged himself to be feudatory of the Pope for his dominions. Every person who knows anything of the feudal system, knows that when the feudatory was disobedient, his superior Lord could deprive him of his territory, and give it to whom he would. Every historian knows that the kings of England succeeded only to the rights of their immediate predecessors. Richard succeeded his father, and John succeeded Richard. Thus upon the feudal principle as King of England, John was feudatory to the Pope, and when John not only disobeyed and opposed the person vested by the custom of the times, with the sovereign author-

ity, but was suspected, and with good reason, of making an offer of transferring his ligeance to Mohammed al Nasir, commonly called the Emir al Moumenim, and also offering to embrace Moslemism, and introduce it into England, Innocent, fully authorized by the law of nations, and not by any article of the Catholic Faith, proceeded to admonish, to threaten, to interdict, to excommunicate, and lastly to dispose of the kingdom of England, and the kingdom of Ireland, which the last three kings had held not in fee, but in fief. We hope this distinction will not be called barefaced quibbling, and will be more intelligible to our Georgian vapulator than the distinction between a piece of meat and an idol.

But to whom did Innocent transfer the realms? To the King of France, and for the most natural of all reasons. Because the kings of England acknowledged the kings of France, as the sovereign lords of their feudatory possessions in France. Even Mr. Hume would inform the *Missionary* that when William the Duke of Normandy was about to enter upon his expedition against England he was a vassal of the French King; and when he applied for leave to invade the realm, he made to the Council of Philip I., then a minor, an offer to do homage to the French King for the English crown in case of his success. Thus when men who slightly skim over the surface of history refer to facts, the nature of which they do not understand, they only exhibit their own want of information. We are brought to this dilemma with men who quote facts like this, and draw similar conclusions. They either want historical information, or common honesty.

The same feudal custom gave to the immediate subordinate vassals of the despoiled chief an option, so that they might serve him if they would; they were not bound to withdraw, though they were at liberty to withdraw. We hope this distinction will be understood. Now in the Roman Catholic Church a doctrine of faith leaves us no option; and in the case of John, we find even Hume himself acknowledged that he was able to muster an army of sixty thousand Roman Catholics, who were ready to fight under his standard, in defence of that possession of which he had been disfranchised; those men in doing so, acted in full accordance with every law then in force, and though they disobeyed the edict of Innocent, they were good Roman Catholics. Here is another of our contradictions. We have no hesitation in asserting that this is totally unintelligible to the *Missionary*, and so it will continue until he shall have studied history and law a little more deeply than he appears to have done.

He asks what peculiar circumstances can render the conduct of the

Popes compatible with that declaration of our Saviour, that his kingdom is not of this world.

We answer—We do not mean to teach him, nor to argue this point with him; our only object being to correct his misrepresentations, and to vindicate ourselves from holding doctrines which we do not hold, but which we condemn and abjure. We do believe that the same individual may be at the same time a temporal sovereign and a clergyman, and that it is no violation of our Lord's declaration, my kingdom is not of this world, for a Presbyterian clergyman to be a member of Congress, or a Governor of a State, or the President of the Union, or the King of a nation. Such is our belief, for which we give no reason, but that we have not entered upon a controversy of doctrine with the *Missionary*, but we wish to correct his misrepresentation of facts.

He says that Roman Catholics cannot know their doctrine. This is not true. Did he see the work of Dezius? Did he ever speak with anyone who did? If he saw it he would not have written as he has done.

The *Exposition of the Roman Catholic Faith* by Bossuet, was not condemned by the University of Louvain. Nor did any Roman Catholic tribunal declare it to be scandalous or pernicious. The Sorbonne never disavowed its doctrines. The Sorbonne is not a Seminary. The Sorbonne never had fathers as the title of its members. Clement X. did not refuse his sanction to the book positively; nor did it undergo any alteration. Yet we believe the *Missionary* might have read all his falsehoods in European publications. It is evidence of Catholic doctrine that a book has received the usual testimonials of our church. The farther he proceeds, . . .

SECTION XI.

In the paper of July 26th, the editor of the *Missionary* gives his answer to our article, which may be found in page 19 of our present volume, published on the 14th of last month. [p. 297.]

As we desire to be always fully explicit, and trust we shall be able to show that we have not been the agressors in this or in any other case, we must go back a little.

It is well known that a continual charge against Roman Catholics by Protestants has been, that the Catholics were guilty of arguing in a vicious circle, and that without this fallacy they could not maintain some of their doctrines; that this fallacy consisted in proving the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of their church, and the

proving the infallibility of their church from the authority of the Scriptures.

In our number for May 19, No. 51, page 307, we undertook to show that such was not the fact; this we did in an article entitled *Bad Logic.* The substance of our article was: A Catholic, with a person who agrees with him in the principle that the Scriptures are the word of God, will use this concession to prove from the Scriptures that the church is infallible,—when he argues with a person who admits the infallibility of the church, he will, from that concession, prove the divine inspiration of the Sacred Bible. But when he speaks to a person who believes neither, he will, without assuming the truth of either the infallibility or the divine inspiration, prove one of them by other topics, and then from that one so proved, demonstrate the other to be true. We gave as an exemplification—a Protestant says he can prove the truth and the divine inspiration of the sacred volume, without the aid of infallibility. If the Protestant can do so, the Catholic can do the same. You say the Protestants can; therefore we say the Catholics can prove the authority of the sacred volume, without the aid of infallibility. When he does so prove it, it is not proved by church infallibility, but by some other means. He now uses the Scriptures, so by other means proved, to prove that the church is infallible; this is not a vicious circle.

You must, then, admit one of two things—either that the Protestant who does not admit the infallibility of the church cannot prove the Scriptures to be the word of God, or you must admit that the Catholic can prove the Scriptures to be the word of God, without the aid of infallibility; and if without the aid of infallibility he can prove the Scriptures to be the word of God, and from the Scriptures so proved, the infallibility of the church, he does not argue in a vicious circle.

In this article we attacked no other body of Christians, but we endeavoured to show that our mode of reasoning had been misrepresented.

The *Missionary* of July 5 inserted our article at full length, and then took a garbled quotation from our issue of June 16, [p. 291] where we stated that we should be at a loss to know how we could prove the divine authority of the sacred volume, unless we had the testimony of some undying, perpetual, and still living body to show us, first, that there was originally full evidence that the contents of a certain book were revealed by God—and next, that this book now in our possession, corresponded exactly with the original, or was the original itself: and we also said that the church was such a body—undying, perpetual, still living.

Now, says the *Missionary*, we have caught you in your own snare,

here is the vicious circle,—for you prove the truth of the Scriptures by the infallibility of your church, and then you prove the infallibility of the church by those same Scriptures, to prove which you were driven to have recourse to your infallibility. We answered on the 14th of July. [p. 297.] First, you omitted part of our article of June 16, by which omission our meaning is distorted; next, you introduce the infallibility of the church, to which we had no recourse in our testimony; and thirdly, we are not guilty of the sophism, for we did not undertake to prove the Scriptures by the infallibility of the church, but by the testimony of an undying, perpetual, and still living body, which originally saw the evidence of those facts which it to-day testifies, viz., that God originally made a revelation, which was written, and that this book corresponds to the original record of that revelation—and this is not infallibility, but the testimony of a good witness. Nor did we undertake to prove the infallibility of the church from the Scriptures, for we did not undertake to prove that the church was infallible.

Our readers will now be able to appreciate the value of the answer. The *Missionary* begins by saying that if he garbled, he was guilty of a grievous fault; and then, after complimenting our nice lynx optics, he inserts what he had previously suppressed. He then gives our article of July 14, in answer to his of the 5th, and thus proceeds:

"In reply, we observe, in the first place, that there was no suppression of truth; for if the next line had been introduced, it would have proved nothing to the point. Dr. Watts say that 'Papists prove the authority of the Scriptures from the infallibility of their church.' The *Miscellany* says that the Scriptures owe their authority to God. And that the *Miscellany* himself draws a distinction between proving and owing, is evident from the next line that follows: 'The church gives no authority to the book, but it gives testimony to the book and to the authority. The witness who is known to be the proper officer of the legislative body, testifies that the leigislature made a law; without his testimony the law has no force; but the law does not derive its authority from him, but from the legislature.' The question of the vicious circle has nothing to do with that to which the Scriptures owe their authority, but with that by which their authority is proved. Hence, the next line could not have defeated either an honest or a dishonest purpose.

"In the second place, there was no suggestion of falsehood, in adding 'aye, and infallible too in its doctrinal decisions,' unless, perchance, they call that a falsehood which the Roman Catholic Church has ever claimed to itself. If we are guilty of a falsehood, we are honoured 'with the company of what the *Miscellany* calls the best, and most numerous, and most enlightened society in the whole world.' If, in enumerating the properties of gold, a person should omit to mention its ductility, a property that is known to belong to it, — and another person in reply should add, aye, and ductile too, the former would come off with but poor grace by saying that the latter had suggested a falsehood. So the *Miscellany*, who calls the church an undying, perpetual, and still living body, must stand in great need of proper weapons of defence when he rejects as false the suggestion of infallibility,

a doctrine which his church is known to appropriate to itself — and thus virtually cast away the sheet-anchor of his confidence.

"Thirdly. The only point in dispute with regard to the vicious circle, is proved from this article. For Roman Catholics will hardly attempt to deny that they depend upon the Scriptures to prove the infallibility of their church. Indeed, we have never known any other arguments introduced to prove that doctrine, except those which were drawn from the Scriptures. We, therefore, conceive it as a fact which they would not attempt to controvert, that they did prove the infallibility of their church from the Scriptures, — and if the authority of the Scriptures was acknowledged, it would be no sophism. It would answer to the *Miscellany's* first case. But it becomes a sophism when they attempt to prove the authority of the Scriptures from the testimony of the church, provided this testimony is questioned. In the instance before us the testimony is questioned. For he is in a strange country. In order to constitute a vicious circle, it is not necessary that both parts of it be contained in the same paragraph, nor in the same essay. If, in this article, *the Miscellany* has proved, from the undying, perpetual, and still living testimony of the church, the authority of the Scriptures,—he certainly would be guilty of a sophism, if, in another article, he should take these same Scriptures which he has thus proved, to prove that the church was this undying, perpetual, and still living body. And this is precisely the course of argument which they use. For what does the *Miscellany* say in this paragraph? He in effect says, that he could not recommend the Scriptures as the word of God, unless he had the testimony of the church. Is it, then, legitimate reasoning to establish from the Scriptures this testimony? Is it not proving one questionable proposition by another?

"Our Eighth Article, which drew forth the reasoning of the *Miscellany* in the garbled passage which we have now considered, is as follows: 'The Sacred Scripture owes its authority to the church, (i. e. the Pope) without whose testimony we should be no more bound to receive it than Livy or the Koran.'

"Here, again, we have misrepresented their doctrine, — 1st, by stating that the Pope was the church; and next, by stating that they believed the Sacred Scripture to owe its authority to the church.

"The parenthesis was introduced merely to show that they sometimes appealed to the one, and sometimes to the other, to support this doctrine, and not to show the identity of the church and the Pope; though it makes but very little difference whether you appeal to the church or to the Pope, for there is evidently an identity of purpose. Besides, when it is said that the church advances such a doctrine, nothing more is meant than that the Pope advances it, — just as it is often said, the United States has recalled her ambassador, when the President has recalled him. Now, who would suppose that the President was the United States in all its latitude and longitude, mountains, plains, and rivers? Yet the *Miscellany* makes himself merry in this kind of style, because he says we have called the church the Pope. He is perfectly welcome to all the advantage it will give him. For it must be a poor cause that needs such helps.

"But the egregious misrepresentation is yet to come, viz.: 'The sacred Scripture owes its authority to the Church.' We will now change the ground and say that it owes it to the Pope, if he likes that better. Martin Luther, it will be remembered, selected from the code of Papal laws, which he consumed, thirty articles, as a specimen of their contents — the last of which is in the following words: 'The Pope does not derive from the Scripture, but the Scripture derives

from the Pope, authority, power, and dignity.' Though we have not the canons from which this article is selected, yet we are disposed to credit the testimony of Luther. 1. Because we have never seen it contradicted. 2. Because he wrote concise remarks on each of them, and published them in a tract, just as the editor of the *Miscellany* has fairly published the eighteen articles which the *Missionary* considered as having been peculiarly favourable to Popery. And 3. Because he was too well acquainted with the nature of polemic disputers to give his enemies the advantage which would have resulted from a false quotation of a canon. If, then, Luther quoted the canon correctly, we have not misrepresented this article."

Now we shall be as concise as possible in our answer. Reader, mark what the question is. Do not lose sight of that. The question is —Was the *Miscellany* guilty of the vicious circle of proving the infallibility of the Scriptures, and of proving the authority of the Scriptures from the infallibility of the church! Now we may unhesitatingly claim an acquittal upon this ground, that we never in this case attempted to prove the infallibility of the church from any topic—therefore we did not attempt to prove it from the Scriptures; therefore we did not fall into the sophism. Next we could claim our acquittal upon the ground that we did not attempt to prove the authority of the Scriptures from the infallibility of the church, but from the testimony of an undying, perpetual, and still living body. Thus, until it can be shown that undying, perpetual, and still living, are terms equivalent to infallibility, we must insist upon an acquittal of having attempted to prove the Scriptures by infallibility. Will the *Missionary* say the terms are the same? If he will, then shall we close this controversy—and then will every corporation and church in existence be infallible, because every existing corporation or church is undying, perpetual, and still living

To the first part of this reply then, we simply rejoin, we prove the two facts regarding the Scriptures, not by an infallible church, but by a competent witness.

To the second, we rejoin, it was a suggestion of falsehood, to introduce the word infallible, inasmuch as it was suggesting that the authority of the Scriptures was then and there proved from the infallibility; when in fact and truth it was not proved therefrom, but from the testimony of a competent witness.

In his third paragraph he states, perhaps correctly, that we would be guilty of the sophism of a vicious circle, if we in one place proved the Scriptures from the undying, perpetual, and still living testimony of the church, and in another place should take these Scriptures to prove that the church was this undying, still living, and perpetual body. But when he asserts the fact, that such is our course, he asserts that which is not true; because we do not and could not prove from the

Scriptures that the church is that undying, still living, and perpetual body.

In a word, his reasoning is bad, because he wishes to persuade his readers and perhaps himself, that two things which are essentially unlike, are the same, viz. an infallible body, an undying, perpetual, and still living body; we repeat, as he gives us credit for logical precision, that until he shall prove that infallible means undying, perpetual, still living, we reject his argument for having four terms instead of three in his syllogism. Put as an enthymeme his argument is this:

You prove the Scriptures by an undying, perpetual, and still living church.

Therefore, you prove the Scriptures by an infallible church.

In this little compass the whole of his bad reasoning is found; we leave it to him to get out of the circle as well as he can.

We are very glad to find he begins to have some rational and correct views of the Pope's power. He is right when he says the Pope is in the Church what Mr. Monroe is in the United States, the supreme head of a confederation of states, each having its own governor, and its own rights, but all bound by solemn law to pay the proper respect and obedience, not to a despot, but to a chief governor with limited and known powers. In the sense in which he says the act of the President is the act of the United States, we allow the act of the Pope is the act of the church. Perhaps by and by we may agree better, and upon more points.

Now as to his last paragraph, we assure him, that it has convinced us more than ever, that Bishop England was right when he said that the facts concerning the Catholic religion were not well known in Georgia. for though the *Missionary* did not see the contradiction to Martin Luther's thirtieth article, the fact is, it has been not only contradicted, but proved to be false and calumnious, over and over again. In the second place, a man's writing concise answers, is no proof that what he answered was held by his adversary—now we need not go far for the proof; the *Missionary* has written concise answers to articles charged as ours, and which were not held by us; and as to the third reason, with us it is of no weight, for Luther wrote more falsehoods than truth, about the Catholic Church. Let the canon be produced, and if it be a genuine document, we will at once abjure Popery.

SECTION XII.

We have repeatedly shown that we did not commence this contest. We have done more: we have avoided entering upon a polemic course

throughout the entire progress of the examination. We have confined ourselves to merely showing that the Roman Catholic Church did not hold the abominable and ridiculous doctrines which were imputed to her directly and indirectly by the *Missionary*—that we were not guilty of the sophistry with which he charged us—that Bishop England did not preach the nonsense which was attributed to him. These were the only points that we sought to establish.

The *Missionary* more than once attacked tenets which we do hold; tenets which are doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. Thus he assailed the doctrine of infallibility, though he evidently does not know our doctrine upon the subject; and blundering about what he does not himself understand, he has had the kindness to tell his readers that because he could not define it, Roman Catholics could not. He then argued against it. To all this we answered not, because, from the beginning, we had determined, if possible, to avoid any doctrinal controversy; especially with so honest, so formidable an antagonist as is the *Missionary*. We think it right now that our dispute seems drawing to a close, to give this brief review.

We had no controversy respecting the truth or falsehood of doctrine. Our controversy was regarding the facts: Does the Roman Catholic Church teach those eighteen propositions? Did Bishop England preach this nonsense at Warrenton? Was the *Miscellany* guilty of the sophism of a vicious circle, by proving the authority of the Scriptures from the infallibility of the Church, and the infallibility of the Church from the Scriptures? These, and only these, were the questions in debate. To our readers who have seen both sides of the argument, we leave the decision. The readers of the *Missionary* are incompetent to decide, because they have had only one side exhibited to them; they saw but a few garbled and distorted and disjointed scraps of our arguments and explanations.

The *Missionary* of August 2d, contains the following paragraph. Our readers will excuse us, if we give it entire, including the small portion of our former matter which it contains; yet we must in candour say, that it is a sign of considerable moral improvement in the writer, because he treats us with more than usual fairness and justice:

THE CATHOLIC MISCELLANY

"As a protracted controversy may be unpleasant to some of our readers, and perhaps subserve no very beneficial purpose, and as our friend, the *Miscellany*, though he may have all a 'prelate's politeness,' is not the most courteous of writers, we shall, for the present, suspend the consideration of the articles in detail, believing that we have already given full satisfaction to every unprejudiced mind, that we

have not grossly misrepresented the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. It may not however be improper, before we dismiss the subject, to give one or two specimens more of his reasoning.

"The *Miscellany,* in reply to our article which says, 'that the church has a right to determine what are the articles of faith which should be believed,' reasons thus:

" 'The church has no such power: for the church, and every member of the church, is obliged to believe every article of faith. He who would choose between doctrines revealed by God, which alone are articles of faith, is by us called a chooser, that is, αιρετικος, which you may translate Heretic, if you prefer that word to the first; and they only who believe all the doctrines revealed by God, that is, all articles of faith, are called faithful. We want testimony to know what God has revealed, and we obtain the testimony for the whole revelation, in the same way that we do for the Scriptures, which are part of God's revelation.' "

"The real force of this reasoning we have not yet been able to discover. It appears very much like a certain cape, which geographers call Point no Point; and yet it has a point too, for it points us out as heretics: but, we shall ever esteem it an honour to be called heretics, if heresy consists in not subscribing to all the articles contained in the Roman Catholic creed. We do not choose to believe them, because we conceive them incompatible with the word of God; and, whatever article of faith may be formed by any man, or body of men, which has not the express written word of God for its authority, we hold ourselves at perfect liberty to reject: nay, we are in conscience bound to reject it. Though 'the church and every member of the church is obliged to believe every article of faith,' yet no one is obliged to believe those who teach for doctrines the commandments of men. If the church has not a right to determine what are the articles of faith which should be believed, why has she assumed it? When the Council of Trent (Sess. 7, Can. 1), denounced an anathema against those who say that the sacraments are more or fewer than seven, did it not determine an article of faith? When the same Council (Sess. 14, Can. 1), expressly decreed that every one is accursed who shall affirm that penance is not truly and properly a sacrament, did it not determine an article of faith? And did it not, (Sess. 6, Can. 32,) when it decreed that the good works of justified persons are truly meritorious, deserving not only an increase of faith, but an increase of glory, anathematize all who deny this doctrine? What do all their canons and anathemas mean, if not to determine what should and what should not be believed? If the above are proper specimens of their articles of faith, we think we are justified in saying that they are not in accordance with the doctrines of divine revelation.

" 'In answer to the article which states that the Pope is the interpreter of Scripture, and the arbiter of all controversies that may arise,' he makes the following remarks:

" 'This proposition divides itself into two: 1. The Pope is the interpreter of Scripture. Now we shall insert the Roman Catholic proposition. 'I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother, the church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scripture.' Thus it is the church which is the interpreter of the Scriptures, and we have before shown that the Pope is not the church; but, in order to remove all ambiguity from the subject, the creed explicitly adds, 'neither will I ever take

and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.' Thus it is plain that the first part of this proposition is not true.

"Second. The Pope is the arbiter of all controversies which may arise. 'We object to this only for its vagueness. In some controversies he has a right to judge, to determine, and to have his judgment executed. Is anarchy desirable? Is it an objection to our religion, that we have tribunals for deciding controversies?'

"Whatever incongruity there may exist between the above statement and the following citation, quoted by good authority from the pontifical law, we will leave for the *Miscellany* to settle as he can. 'The Pope has the power to interpret Scripture, and to teach as he pleases, and no person is allowed to interpret in a different way.' Leo XI. came into the pontificate with this triumphal motto on his pageant — *Dignus est Leo in virtute Agni accipere librum et solvere septem signacula ejus* — (In virtue of the Lamb, Leo is worthy to take the book, and loose the seven seals thereof.) For a particular account of the woman clothed in scarlet, see Scott on *Revelations* xvii.

"To the proposition, Implicit faith is highly recommended, he thus replies:

"'The truth or falsehood of this proposition depends upon its meaning; its meaning is to be discovered from the context. If it means that the Roman Catholic Church highly recommends belief of her doctrines, without examining or caring to know upon what ground that belief is to rest, and without having a rational motive for belief: in this meaning the proposition is false, because the Roman Catholic Church tells her children, that their belief ought to be founded on rational and sufficient motives, and calls upon them to examine, and to know the ground of those motives.'

"Calls upon them to examine and 'know the ground of those motives,' when they shut up the keys of knowledge! when they lock the Holy Scriptures from their children, as they frequently have done! when they make the traditions of their church of equal authority with the pure light of insipration! He must have a different view of rational motives from any which we have received; for, if you sift these rational motives to the bottom, you will find that they rest entirely upon the testimony of the church — upon traditions pretended to have been handed down from the days of the Apostles. If asked the reason of their faith, their reply is, not that God in his word has told me so, but that the church has told me so. Thus, when they say mass, when they sprinkle holy water, when they bow before images, when they pray to angels and departed saints, when they make offering for souls in purgatory: for these and a thousand other inconsistences, they plead tradition. But the origin of most of their ceremonies is too well known, to be believed that they obtained in the Apostles' day; yet a Catholic would be sinning against his own soul, to question the tradition of his church!"

Now, we proceed to examine only the mistakes, or worse, of this article: its demerits, in other respects, are too low to call even for our reproof.

He complains that he cannot see the real force of our reasoning. We cannot assert that he does. We shall put it in other words, perhaps more intelligible.

"Nothing can be an article of faith, except it be revealed by God." That the *Missionary* knew this, he gives us full evidence; for his propo-

sition 15, which was the only one acknowledged by us to be true, is the following: "They define faith to be a general assent to all things revealed by God, and proposed to us by the church, written or unwritten." In our remarks upon this, which the *Missionary* saw, we put this explanation: "We do not look upon ourselves as bound to believe one proposition more than his revelation: though all the popes and bishops and councils should call upon us to believe, we are not bound to believe; it is not faith to believe anything but what God reveals; but faith binds us to believe all his revelations." This is our principle; by this we stand or fall; "and proposed to us by the church," yes, provided it be revealed by God, we will believe it, not otherwise. The church testifies to the fact that God revealed it. We look upon her to be a competent witness; but we do not believe she has power to add one particle to the revelation of God. Thus the *Missionary* must have known that it was a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, "that nothing is an article of faith, except it has been revealed by God." Now, we say the church has no power to choose which of the doctrines revealed by God she will teach, she must teach them all. Thus she has no right to determine what are the articles of faith which should be believed. Thus it was a mistake, or worse, to say she had a power which she had not. We hope we have now made ourselves intelligible to this choosing adversary.

In the very article of ours which he reviews we read, and he printed the following words: "they only who believe all the doctrines revealed by God, that is, all articles of faith, are called faithful;" thus he had evidence that we did not look upon any doctrine to be an article of faith, unless it had been revealed by God, yet he has the dishonesty, in his comment, to insinuate that such is not our principle, when he writes of "articles of faith formed by men, or a body of men." The very expression is an absurdity which we reject. No man, no body of men can form an article of faith, though a competent witness may testify that God revealed a particular doctrine; but this witness does not form the doctrine which God has revealed, and which he has testified. Thus the Apostles were not sent to form doctrines, but to testify what they had seen and heard: and their testimony gave certainty, because they were competent witnesses.

The church never assumed the right either in the Council of Trent or elsewhere, of determining what articles of faith should be believed; but she frequently did exercise that right which every chooser assumes to himself of determining what was an article of faith and what was not, and we are yet to learn that several hundred intelligent and pious men assembled together, carefully to examine evidence and to pray for

the divine aid, have not as good a right to say that they have a certainty that this is an article of faith, and that its contradictory is not, as one chooser would have to determine what article of faith ought to be believed. We agree that no one is obliged to believe those who teach for doctrines the commandments of men. But a question we shall not now examine is, who are they that do so teach.

Did this unfortunate writer ever read the Canons of the Council of Trent? We shall give one specimen of his mistakes, or worse. To follow him through all his blunders, would indeed be tedious, and laborious, and disgusting. He states that the 32d Canon of the sixth session, is that the good works of justified persons, deserve not only an increase of faith, but an increase of glory, and so forth. We shall now give the Canon. But how could we expect that a writer who falsifies the Scripture would not misrepresent a Canon of a Popish Council?

Si quis dixerit, hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita, aut ipsum justificatum, bonis operibus, quae ab eo per Dei gratiam, et Jesu Christi meritum, cujus vivum membrum est, fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiae, vitam aetenam, et ipsius vitae aeternae (si tamen in gratia decesserit) consecutionem, atque etiam gloriae angmentum; anathema sit.[75]

"If any one shall say that the good works of a justified person are in such manner the gifts of God, as that they are not also the good merits of the said justified person, or that the said justified person by those good works, which are done by him through the grace of God, and the merits of Jesus Christ, whose living member he is, doth not truly deserve increase of grace, eternal life, and the obtaining of the said eternal life (provided, however, he shall have departed in grace) and also the increase of glory; let him be anathema."

In this canon we cannot find the *Missionary's* increase of faith, nor a syllable regarding faith. Why will this man undertake to write upon subjects of which he knows nothing?—absolutely nothing. He has not then given "proper specimens of our articles of faith."

He is just as little qualified to write upon geography as he is upon theology. In the name of nautical phraseology, which it is clear he does not understand, what geographer has given the latitude and longitude of Cape Point No Point? "Did he ever see a ship or the sea in his life?" So point no point is geography. Thank you kindly for the news. Morse must put this into his next edition. How erudite a *Missionary*! He quotes Scripture correctly; has found out the occult fact that there does exist pontifical law of which the world was heretofore ignorant; mends the canons of general councils, and is able to turn Point No Point in geography! ! !

His quotation from the *Pontifical Law*, we know nothing about, for

[75] *Conc. Trid. Sess.* vi. celebrat, die xiii. Jan. MDXLVII. Can. XXXII.

we know of no pontifical law. If he means that it is part of the doctrine of our church, that "the Pope has power to interpret in an arbitrary way," he means what is not true, for this is no principle of a Roman Catholic, either in law or in equity, or in any other way. If Leo XI. came into the pontificate with such a motto, we know nothing about it, nor does it concern us more than if Mr. Monroe had come into office with a similar motto upon his coach; the motto of his coach would not become either the Declaration of Independence, nor the Constitution of the United States, nor a law of Congress. As for Mr. Scott, we must profess our disinclination to his company; neither do we desire any fellowship with the woman in the Revelations, nor with any other of her description. As regards the concluding rhapsody, we shall not enter into controversy with the writer who penned this article, if we can avoid it. We should be much more inclined to have for our antagonist the writer of his preceding article, whose production we reviewed in our former number, and certainly, if we mistake not, was a better, though not a more honest writer than he who has given the exhibition just now got rid of. We have not the honour of knowing either, and if they are done, we part in peace.

SECTION XIII.

We thought our labours had been closed, but we have been disappointed. We frequently declared our determination not to enter into any controversy upon a doctrinal subject with this writer, if we could fairly and properly avoid it. But we fear we must give up that determination. The *Missionary* has broken new ground. He comes forward to preach that Roman Catholics are idolaters; but however offensive the charge may be, we do not complain of the language in which it is conveyed. We shall then take up the sermon, for such it appears to be, and examine it fairly, and should he reply, and we feel ourselves called upon to rejoin, we pledge ourselves not to use uncourteous language; we shall not let slip a harsh expression. We would also suggest that if he means to act fairly he ought to publish the answers as we do the attacks.

"Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves (for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire) lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female," and so forth. (*Deut.* iv.)

"If this passage of Divine Revelation possesses any authority, and is enforced by any reasoning, we are unable to account for the consistency of those who fill their churches with images. In the communications of the Divine Will to the children of Israel, there was a voice, but no similitude. Had it been otherwise,

there might have been some shadow of pretext for the violation of the second commandment. When we speak of a church, the constitution and principles of which are in many respects diametrically opposed to that in which we have been educated, a tincture of prejudice is doubtless visible, though the utmost caution is taken to avoid it. On this subject, however, we cannot think that prejudice alone is the governing principle. Every intelligent Protestant on his first entering a Catholic church and witnessing the devotion of the people, must feel shocked, if at nothing else, at their prostrations before their images. Though he may be well assured that they consider these images in no other respect capable of profiting them than by putting them in remembrance of the great atoning sacrifice, yet it bears so close an analogy to the forms of worship among heathen nations, that he cannot avoid pitying their delusion. If in churches there are images, and in temples there are idols, where is the difference between them? Thomas Aquinas (*Summa* 3, part q. 25, art. 3) says, *Ne imagini quidem Christi in quantum est res quaedam, puta lignum sculptum, vel pictum ulla debuter reverentia,* and so forth.—No reverence is due to the image of Christ, as it is but an image, or wood graven or painted, and so forth. Arnobius (lib. 6) shows the opinions which the Gentiles entertain of their own idolatry: *Non adorabant statuas, quod putabant, aes, aurum, argentum, aut similes statuarum materias, Deos esse, sed quod per ea dii invisibles honorentur*—"They worshipped images, not that they thought brass, gold, silver, or such materials of their statues to be gods, but because by those things the invisible gods were worshipped." So, through the medium of their images, Catholics worship the invisible God. Admit that they can distinguish between the image and the thing represented by it; it is no less idolatry on that account, as we shall presently show.

"It must be acknowledged that Micah, of whom we read in the seventeenth chapter of *Judges,* was an idolater. 'He had an house of gods, and made an ephod and teraphim, and consecrated one of his sons, who became his priest.' But when a Levite became his priest, he says, 'Now I know that Jehovah will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest.' He does not say, now I know that my teraphim will do me good, or that the graven or molten images that are in my house will do me good? — but his confidence appears to be placed in the Lord Jehovah; yet he was an idolater, and he sinned, not in worshipping his images as God, but in supposing that God would be pleased with this form of worship. Now these images might have been used to excite in this idolater a lively remembrance of the wonders which God had wrought, and gratitude for his goodness. The silver of which they were formed had been dedicated to the Lord, and Micah knew it: and he doubtless thought that the object for which it was dedicated would be best answered by making it into graven or molten images. Now Catholics do not ask their images to bless them, for they know that they are nothing more than gold, or silver, or wood; yet he who can draw a distinction between the worship that Micah paid to his teraphim, and that which is paid to images in the Catholic Church, must possess powers of discrimination beyond ordinary capacities. We fear indeed that it is the rock on which many split and make shipwreck of their souls. In the second chapter of *Judges,* 11th verse, we learn that the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim. And what was Baalim? Did they think that image to be God? Certainly not, for the prophet *Hosea* (ii. 16) plainly shows that they had called God Baalim. Again, can we suppose that the children of Israel were so grossly ignorant as to believe that the ear-rings which they plucked off to make a golden calf, had become the God of heaven and earth; the supposition is unreasonable.

The greater probability is, that they meant to worship the God of heaven who had wrought such a surprising deliverance for them, through the instrumentality of this image. They could not be so infatuated as to suppose that this calf was the very God that brought them up out of the land of Egypt, because that God which they had made had no existence at that time, and they knew it. And if they were idolaters, what must we think of those who now worship God in an image, or by it, or under it, or make it an instrument to remind them of God?''

Our first remark is respecting the two texts one from the *Summa* of St. Thomas of Aquin, the other from Arnobius. That from St. Thomas though not correctly quoted is substantially correct. It merely shows us that whoever made the extract is not much to be depended upon, for the omission of one word would change the entire meaning of the phrase. Another rule of sound criticism is, that a solitary passage without its context, so far from leading to a knowledge of the author's meaning will very frequently mislead. We admit that although much distorted as to the placing of all the words, and much changed as to some of the words, the doctrine of St. Thomas is fairly given. The Catholic Church has approved of that doctrine, thus the doctrine is fairly ours.

Now as to Arnobius: we have not just now a copy of his work by us, but we recollect sufficient for our purpose of its nature, and we also have by us works which refer to it. When we come to treat of his text in the argument, we shall show that his text cannot mean what it would there appear to insinuate.

The argument of the sermon is this. The heathens were idolaters, because they worshipped the invisible Gods, by statues which they did not believe to be Gods, but the representation of Gods. But Roman Catholics worship the invisible God, through the medium of images, which they do not believe to be God, but the representation of God. Therefore the Roman Catholics are idolaters. We deny the conclusiveness of the reasoning, because we deny the parity of the cases. The heathens worshipped many Gods. Roman Catholics worship only one God. The heathens were polytheists, the Roman Catholics are not polytheists. If we now admit a part of the first commandment to be taken as the second: we say the principal aim of the second commandment, was very different from what is here insinuated. The heathen violated the first commandment. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me; if then through the image or without it, he did worship more gods than one, he was a transgressor. Even if he worshipped but one god, suppose Jupiter, the Jew would have been still a transgressor, because the one God whom he should adore was specified, ''the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bond-

age." We may then admit the paragraph from Arnobius, and still it will make nothing against the Roman Catholic.

We now take the case of Micah. He had at least two gods, "a graven image and a molten image." "An house of gods." Now a Roman Catholic, has but one God—God has forbidden any person to consecrate priests or to wear the priestly dress except those of the tribe of Levi, of the seed of Aaron. Micah violated this law in all its parts. Micah did more, he violated the special law of *Deuteronomy*, which is taken as the text of the sermon. Also, we say his criminality consisted in the violation of a law which does not oblige Christians, as we will subsequently show; if we can show this, of course the Christian may do without any crime, what would be criminal in Micah.

We have now to complain of wilful misrepresentation of the meaning of a text of Scripture, or else the preacher has undertaken a task for which he is unqualified. The object of the preacher is to show that the word *Baalim* means God, and he asserts that the prophet Hosea testifies the fact: such is not the case; the word Baalim is plural and signifies gods; the Prophet does not testify as the preacher states, but he testifies that the sinful people of Israel will call the Lord *Ishi* after their repentance and not *Baali*, as in the days of their wickedness. There are two charges made by the Prophet against the people. 1. That they served *Baalim*, the plural, *gods*, that is, fell into polytheism. 2. That they called the Lord, *Baali*, the singular, that is, they gave him the name of the deity of the heathens, in place of his own name *Ishi*. Thus as Baalim is plural, like cherubim, seraphim, and so forth, all Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic plurals, which terminated in *im*: when the writer of the *Book of Judges* complains that the children of Israel served Baalim, he complains of their having fallen into polytheism; now the Roman Catholics adore *only one God*, therefore their case is not similar to any of those adduced.

"For their mother had played the harlot: she that conceived them hath done shamefully, for she said, I will go after my lovers, and so forth.

"And she shall follow after her *lovers*, but she shall not overtake *them*, and she shall seek them but shall not find them; then shall she say, I shall go and return to my first husband, for then it was better with me than now.

"For she did not know that I gave her corn and wine and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold which they prepared for Baal, (*singular.*)

"Therefore will I return and take away my corn," and so forth.

"And I will visit upon her the days of Baalim (*plural*), when she burned incense to them . . . . and she went after her lovers and forgot me, saith the Lord." (*Hosea* ii. 5-13.)

Can anything be more plain than that God, who always calls a

desertion of his services to serve strange gods, by the name which designates the crime of a woman, who leaves her covenanted husband to serve the lewdness of one or more lovers, here complains first of desertion of himself, and next serving strange *gods, many lovers, Baalim*? All plural! Now a Roman Catholic does not desert the Lord, does not forget the Lord, does not serve other gods, therefore no one of those cases applies to him. It is upon the same principle the Lord when he demands fidelity to himself, only forbidding the criminality of serving strange gods, gives the monition, that he is a jealous god. He will admit no participation. We have here but very slightly touched the proofs, but we feel we have given enough. Now, why did not the preacher give us all the text from the book of Judges?

"And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim.

"And they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them, and bowed themselves down and provoked the Lord to anger.

"And they forsook the Lord, and served Baal and Ashtaroth." (*Judges* ii-13.)

How can we complain of having our writings garbled for certain purposes, when the divine word of God, the sacred volume is garbled, and made to say what it does not contain? In the *Book of Judges* the Israelites are accused for having forsaken God, and served Baal and Ashtaroth, the Baalim or gods of the surrounding nations, and desertion of the true God, and the other crime of polytheism. Now, will the preacher say Roman Catholics have done this?

As to the case of the golden calf, we shall not allow any surmises or probabilities of the preacher against the direct testimony of the word of God. Now that testifies to us 1, polytheism in their principle; 2, a desertion of the great principle which God had given them: we admit of no suppositions where we have facts. Now, we have in the word of God the following facts: 1. This people had been a long time in Egypt, part of whose idolatrous worship was that of a bull, that of a calf, and so forth. 2. In Egypt there was polytheism. 3. This people gathered unto Aaron and said unto him, "up and make us gods," then "gods of gold." 4. The great principle which was covenanted between God and the people, at their own request, was that God should not speak to them, except through Moses, and that they would wait the return of Moses and from him receive the law. We now need not have recourse to surmises or to probabilities, for the word of God gives us positive testimony of these facts. 1. The people violated the principles of agreement; they did not wait the return of Moses. 2. They asked for gods, which was polytheism. 3. They made the likeness of a calf, which was Egyptian idolatry. 4.

They had in their worship very shameful and criminal rites. Upon all those grounds they were in a very different situation from what Roman Catholics are.

We now lay down an essential difference between the Roman Catholic practice and idolatry. It is stated by the preacher that the heathens looked upon the statues not to have any inherent divinity, not to be gods, but to be merely the representation of gods, to be exactly what the Roman Catholics look upon their images to be, and nothing more. Upon what does the preacher found this assertion? 1. Upon the testimony of Arnobius. 2. Upon his own surmises, probabilities, conjectures, common sense. Let us examine the only direct testimony which he adduces.—Arnobius says they did not look upon brass, and so forth, to be gods. Granted. We do not want such a statement, but the proposition, "this brass is not God," and this other, "God resides in or about this brass," are not the same. Now, the heathen might not hold the first, though he did hold the last, and in fact the greater part of the heathens did hold the last. They thought, that when the statue was dedicated an infusion of the divinity immediately took place at its dedication, and that the God was either in or about the statue; and thus though the heathen did not believe the brass to be God, he looked upon God and the brass to be inseparably connected, and this was idolatry; for this image, which thus became as if hypostatically and indivisibly united to the divinity became an idol, and the object of his adoration; just as the Christian believes the divinity to be hypostatically and indivisibly united to the human nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, and this divine person, though partly of human nature, becomes the object of the Christian adoration. Thus no Roman Catholic believes any connexion of this sort between God and the image; the image is then a mere representation, not to be adored; it is not an idol and the Roman Catholic is not an idolater.

We have supposed the quotation from Arnobius to be correctly given; of this we have great doubts: for where we find so many other mistakes in its company, we need not be quite certain here. Now, we suspect that in the original there are some qualifying passages, which would reduce this sentence from the general, or rather universal character, that it has here, to be merely particular. Our reasons for this suspicion are: 1. The whole of the fourth book of Arnobius is a very severe censure, and many times witty and elegant raillery of the heathens, for the general belief that there was some inherent divinity in the idol. In his first book, he writes thus of himself, before his conversion to Christianity:

Venerabur, o coecitas, nuper simulacra modo ex fornacibus prompta, in incudibus Deos, et exmalleis fabricatos.

"I lately venerated, O blindness! images just taken from the furnaces, and *gods* made by sledges."

Tanquam inesset vis presens, adulabar, affabar, et beneficia poscebam.

"As if there had been some power present in them, I used to flatter, to address, and to ask favours of them."

Deos esse credebam ligna, lapides, ossa, ant in hujusmodi rerum habitare materia.

"*I used to believe* that stocks of wood, stones, bones, *were gods*, or that in the matter of this kind they used to inhabit."

2. All the heathen writers, Virgil, Horace, Hermes Trismegistus, all in fact, testify that such was their belief. 3. The Holy Scriptures are full of the direct charges of this belief.

"This Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that there be no gods, which are made with hands." (*Acts* xix. 26.)

"They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, of silver, and of brass, and of iron, of wood, and of stone."

"But hast lift up thyself against the Lord of heaven; and they have brought the vessels of his house before thee, and thou, and thy lords, thy wives, and thy concubines have drunk wine in them; and thou hast praised the gods of silver and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know: and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, thou hast not glorified." (*Daniel* v. 4, 23.)

3. All the early writers of the Christian church charge the heathens with this belief. Now, we consider the direct testimony of the sacred volume, and all this other evidence, to be better than the surmise of the preacher.

But, if he wants a reason for the stupidity, he will find it in the fact, that at this day many nations are equally besotted. Let him ask the worshippers of Juggernaut, of the venerable Boodho; the Tartar, or the people of some of the islands of the Pacific. If he has not seen it himself, we could describe to him a very convenient nut-cracker, with an eye and a half of mother-of-pearl, and a bit of hair nailed on its chin, and having some distant resemblance to a deformed human figure, which some of his brethren sent round to beg fourpences, at schools and at churches, from little and big children, and which was exhibited as the very god, the identical god which those islands had given up for the Bibles, that they were not yet able to spell. Now the time was when all nations sat in darkness and the shadow of death. The time was when, in the most enlightened cities, the most learned men were bewildered, and used to try and feel for God, and used to hear every person that was a setter forth of strange gods, and they took all, and raised altars even to the unknown God; their priests told them that the divinity resided in those idols: they heard answers, oracles were delivered; Pythonesses

were found, not at Delphos only. The whole world followed blindly: we have evidence of the fact, we want no conjecture.

Now, we could easily give to the preacher abundant evidence from the sacred volume, to show that many times previous to the making of the calf and the other idols, for though the calf was the principal, others are alluded to, the people of Israel did fall into idolatry. We will content ourselves with referring him to the study of *Ezekiel* xxiii. They were idolatrous in Egypt, and this was but a relapse into Egyptian idolatry. The Egyptians and other Gentiles did not, by images, worship the true God. If Baal and Ashtaroth were names for the true God, why would the people be asked, which will you choose, Baal, which is a name of the true God, or the true God who brought you from Egypt? Would the preacher ask us to believe that the erring Israelites, who were idolaters, did believe Baal to be the God who brought their fathers from Egypt? What does Moses say of those sacrifices? Will he tell us they adored God under the appearance of images? Hear what he says:

"They provoked him to jealousy with strange gods, with abominations provoked him to anger.

"They sacrificed unto devils, not to God: to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not." (*Deut.* xxxii. 16, 17.)

This alludes to the worship of the calf and its appurtenances: yet the preacher would have us believe, contrary to the written word of God, that they sacrificed to God, and not to devils.

But, says the preacher, those things which were consecrated and celebrated were to the Lord, that is, to the true God. Our answer is short: the record and the fact say no; the word which is translated Jehovah, means indiscriminately any Lord God, whether it be Baal, or Jupiter, or Nilus, or Apollo, or Apis; our Lord, our God. Thus we find in all those cases: 1, Polytheism; 2, the belief of a divinity in the idol; 3, the worship of devils, in opposition to that of the true God. Not one of those circumstances is found in the use of images amongst Roman Catholics.

The Protestant version of the Scriptures has many changes, for special purposes, amongst which is one of which we may fairly avail ourselves here. In the *Psalm* which it numbers xcvi. 5, it has: "For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens." We know the translation is incorrect: but, addressing ourselves to those who look upon it to be correct, we say; you distinguish between the Lord who made the heavens and idols; now you acknowledge that Roman Catholics adore the God who made the heavens; thus it does not require

"powers of discrimination beyond ordinary capacities," to say that they do not, in adoring the Lord who made the heavens, adore idols.

We did hope we should be able to close our critique upon the sermon in this, but we must defer the remainder to our next, lest we should overload the columns of the *Missionary*, who will doubtless have the honour, the candour, and the conscience to give insertion to our reply.

SECTION XIV.

Idolatry.—We have seen in our last that the difference between the doctrines and practices of Roman Catholics and heathens and idolatrous Jews consisted, 1, in the belief and worship of only one God by the former, and the latter being Polytheists, or worshippers of many Gods. 2. In the Catholics considering their images to be mere representations of some determined objects, to the knowledge and contemplation and service of which objects the mind was brought by means of the image, whilst idolaters considered some divinity as residing in or united to the idol, and therefore served the idol itself. And 3. In the Catholic confining his adoration to the only and true God who made the heavens and the earth, whilst the idolaters worshipped devils and not God.

We next proceed to ascertain what is the difference between an image and an idol. An image is the likeness of something which exists, or which has existed. Thus images of men are likenesses of those men. An image of a cherub is a likeness of a cherub or of what was shown as a model of the image, and like to which it was to be made. Thus the statue of Gen. Washington is an image, it is not an idol. Thus the figures of the cherubim at the mercy-seat were images, not idols. What then is an idol? It is a figure made to represent some false deity, and generally speaking, in which that deity is supposed to reside. It is not the representation of any thing or person actually existing, or which did actually exist as a deity. Suppose Jupiter to have been a single, individual, human being, and that an image was made to represent the man, this would not be an idol, it could have been made and erected without any criminality, as we this day make and erect statues or images of great men, as we make family busts, or statues, or pictures. But let some person imagine Jupiter to be a god—he imagines a lie; let him suppose some divinity to reside in that statue, he supposes a falsehood; let him adore the statue, here is double idolatry, and the statue is to him an idol. Thus what was once a useful image may by change of circumstances become a dangerous idol.

"And the Lord said unto Moses, make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon

a pole: And it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live.

"And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass he lived." (*Numbers*, xxi. 8, 9.)

There can be no question but this brazen image which God commanded Moses to make, was lawfully made, and was useful, and was not an idol. That it afterwards became an idol we have evidence: speaking of the good king Ezechias or Hezekiah in the *IV. Kings*, Catholic version, but the *II.* according to the Protestant version, we read:

"He removed the high places, and broke the images (it ought to be idols), and cut down the groves, and broke in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it." (*II Kings*, xviii. 4.)

The burning of incense to any person or thing, except to the Lord in the Temple, was specially forbidden under pain of death.

Every image then is not an idol. An idol is the figure made to represent an imaginary or false deity. Thus the prophet *Hosea*, vii. 3, calls them "lies," in verse 1, "for they commit falsehood." Habakkuk ii. 18, "the molten image, and a teacher of lies." Thus St. Paul, *I Cor.* viii. 4, says, "we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. 5. For though there be that are called gods," and so forth. Having now seen the distinction between an image and an idol, we say, there can be no doubt but that, even by the law of nature, it is a high crime to make, or to keep, or to serve an idol. There is nothing in the law of nature to prevent our making images. But should an image become an idol it ought then to be destroyed.

Our next inquiry is, to ascertain whether God prohibited the making of images. One corollary must be inevitable. If God prohibited the making of images, every statuary is a criminal. But this consequence must not stand in our way if we can find such a law.

The sermon says the second commandment is a prohibition thereof, and that the text which it prefixes is a distinct prohibition also. We must take each part separately, for though they appear to mean a general prohibition, we shall soon show that they are both only special, and very limited, and perhaps in some degree only temporary. We shall first take what is called the second commandment.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.

"Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord

thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate me.

"And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." (*Exodus*, xx. 4-6.)

Catholic Version: "Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in the heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth.

"Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them: I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.

"And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and weep my commandments." (*Exodus*, xx. 4-6.)

We shall here remark upon the difference of translation. According to the Protestant version the making of a graven image would appear to be prohibited. According to the Catholic translation, the making of a graven thing only. What is the difference? Precisely what we marked before. An image is the likeness of something. An idol is an imagination, it is not the likeness of anything.

Taking the Catholic version, we shall show this law to be consistent with the facts on record in the sacred volume, and not to be a prohibition of making images. Graven thing is an idol, the indefinite word thing being used to express that figure which was not an image, for it had no prototype. This forbids the making of idols. Next is forbidden the making of likenesses, that is, of images of things which do exist in the heavens, on earth, or in the sea. Did the prohibitory clause rest here, we allow that a new law had been made against image-making, and therefore that every statuary would be a criminal; a man could not even engrave the likeness of a bird, of a fish, of an ox, of a fruit, without crime, but the same prohibitory clause continues to say, they shall not be adored. Now if the first was absolutely prohibitory, this part prohibiting adoration would never have been given; for what could be adored unless it had been made; and if it was prohibited to make an image, the person who made it was already a criminal. We say then the meaning is plainly this: "you shall not make an idol, nor shall you make an image to adore it, for you deprive me of my honour, and convert the image into an idol when you adore it, or when you engage yourself in its service!" That is, we say it is the full explanation of v. 3, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," which would be done in either of two ways, viz. by setting up for yourself idols, as the Egyptians and the surrounding nations do; or by paying adoration and service which are due to me only, to images or likenesses of things which exist. This is the explanation of our church which forbids idolatry and polytheism, but permits images.

Now let us suppose the making of images to be prohibited, we shall have God contradicting himself, for the following are passages of the Holy Bible:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses saying,

"And thou shalt make a mercy-seat of pure gold: two cubits and a half shall be the length thereof, and a cubit and a half the breadth thereof.

"And thou shalt make two cherubim of gold, of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy-seat.

"And make one cherub on the one end, and the other cherub on the other end: even of the mercy-seat shall ye make the cherubim on the two ends thereof.

"And the cherubim shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy-seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another: toward the mercy-seat shall the faces of the cherubim be." (*Exodus* xxv. 1, 17-20.)

This was certainly making the likeness of things in heaven, and image-making by the command of God, who we are told prohibited it as idolatrous. Now we shall see images of flowers and fruit, and things on earth, made by the same authority.

"31. And thou shalt make a candlestick of pure gold: of beaten work shall the candlestick be made: his shaft, and his branches, his bowls, his knops, and his flowers shall be of the same."

"31. Three bowls shall be made like unto almonds, with a knop and a flower, in one branch, and so forth.

"34. And in the candlestick shall be four bowls made like unto almonds," and so forth.

We next find images of fruit upon the High Priest's dress:

"And beneath upon the hem of it thou shalt make pomegranates of blue and of purple, and of scarlet round about the hem thereof: and bells of gold between them round about.

"A golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate upon the hem of the robe round about." (*Exod.* xxviii, 33, 34.)

See what a command was given by the Lord, to Moses in *Numbers* xxi. to make an image of a brazen serpent. Are we then to say that he forbids and that he commands the same thing to the same people at the very same time? Perhaps our friend the preacher, would be at some loss "to account for the consistency" of the Lord God of Israel filling with his presence a "church filled with images," of which we shall give a very brief enumeration taken from his own Bible, *I Kings*; yet so it is that the word of God, informs us that the house was filled with images, and that God vouchsafed to fill it with his presence, after the *Missionary* and Calvin, from whose *Institutes* he has condensed his sermon, would tell us, God prohibited the making of images and the filling up of churches therewith.

"And the cedar of the house within was carved with knops and open flowers.

"And within the oracle he made two cherubim of olive tree, each ten cubits high.

"And five cubits was the one wing of the cherub and five cubits the other

wing of the cherub; from the uttermost part of the one wing unto the uttermost part of the other were ten cubits.

"And the other cherub was ten cubits: both the cherubim were of one measure and size.

"The height of the one cherub was ten cubits, and so was it of the other cherub.

"And he set the cherubim within the inner house; and they stretched forth the wings of the cherubim, so that the wing of the one touched the one wall, and the wing of the other cherub touched the other wall; and their wings touched one another in the midst of the house.

"And he overlaid the cherubim with gold.

"And he covered all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubim and palm trees and open flowers, within and without.

"The two doors also were of olive tree; and he carved upon them carvings of cherubim and palm trees and open flowers: and overlaid them with gold and spread gold upon the cherubim and upon the palm trees.

"And he carved thereon cherubim, and palm trees and open flowers: and covered them with gold fitted upon the carved work." (*I Kings* vi. 18-35.)

"And he made the pillars, and two rows round about upon the one network, to cover the chapiters that were on the top with pomegranates.

"And upon the top of the pillars was lily work, and so forth.

"And he made a molten sea ten cubits from one brim to the other; it was round all about, and his height was five cubits: and a line of thirty cubits did compass it round about.

"It stood upon twelve oxen, three looking towards the north, and three looking towards the west, and three looking towards the south, and three looking towards the east: and the sea was set above them, and all their hinder parts were inward.

"And it was an hand breadth thick, and the brim thereof was wrought like the brim of a cup, with flowers and lilies, and so forth.

"And on the borders that were between the edges were lions, oxen and cherubim, and so forth.

"For on the plates of the ledges thereof, and on the borders thereof, he graved cherubim, lions, and palm-trees," and so forth. (Chap. vii. 18-36.)

Now we doubt if anywhere, our squeamish friend could find a Roman Catholic church, better furnished with the likenesses of things in heaven and in earth, graven and molten, and beaten, in all variety of workmanship; yet were all those images made by the regulation of God himself, who upon the dedication of the church, which was filled with them, vouchsafed to fill it with his presence, and told him who dedicated this house filled with images.

"I have hallowed this house, which thou hast built, to put my name for ever: and mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually." (Chap. ix. 3.)

We beg leave then to inform the preacher, that although the law of revelation did distinctly prohibit idolatry, they did both permit the making of images, and God himself did specially command Moses to make them and to place them in the most holy part of the place of public worship, and did through the instrumentality of one image confer upon

his people the greatest benefits, although he foresaw that in after ages that same image of a serpent would become an idol, and be destroyed by a good king; still the possibility of a remote and contingent evil which could be remedied when it should exist, did not prevent his commanding the image to be made. We also find that in the days of Solomon he filled with his presence a house of worship, filled with images.

We now come to consider the preacher's text, upon which he remarks.

"Take therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spoke to you in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire:

"Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure the likeness of male or female," and so forth. (*Deut.* iv. 15-16.)

"If this passage of Divine Revelation possesses any authority, and is enforced by any reasoning, we are unable to account for the consistency of those who fill their churches with images."

Now we say, that passage does possess the full force of God's authoritative command delivered by the mouth of Moses, to the people of Israel, and that the reasoning is conclusive. But we must have the entire passage fairly before us to know the extent of the prohibition and to see the full force of the reasoning. We shall therefore give the succeeding portion of the Scripture.

"17. The likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air.

"18. The likeness of anything that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth:

"19. And lest thou lift up thy eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun and moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all the nations under the whole heaven."

Now we have the whole sentence before us, and its meaning and reasoning are obviously—"You saw no figure of God at Horeb that you may be convinced of his spiritual nature, and to guard you against imagining that he is like those forms of males and females, of beasts or fishes, or such like as are used amongst nations for gods, nor the sun nor moon. The object was to guard you against idolatry, lest making such a likeness, you might be brought to worship or to serve it. You are therefore commanded not to make any representation of God, for you saw no model." The reasoning is good, the command is clear. But the command is special, "Do not make any figure to represent God." Beyond that, the command does not extend, nor would the reasoning extend farther. You saw no likeness, and because you saw no likeness you shall make no representation. This leaves them at full liberty to make

a likeness of anything they saw. They might make images of what they saw, but having seen no likeness of God, they could make no representation of God. Thus, as we remarked, this command is restricted to very narrow limits, and is not a prohibition of image-making. If it was a general prohibition, Moses would have been a violator; Solomon in the very act for which God specially approves and rewards him would have been a violator. Bezaleel and Aholiab, and every wise-hearted man, in whom the Lord put wisdom and understanding to know how to work all manner of work for the service of the sanctuary, according to all that the Lord had commanded, (*Exod.* xxxvi.,) were transgressors, and the Lord himself was the instigator to the violation of his own precept. But if it be lawful to make images, though forbidden to make idols; if it be lawful to make images but not an image of the Deity, then neither of those persons did wrong; Roman Catholics do not wrong, and God did not command contradictions; every word of the sacred volume remains in full force, and Roman Catholics are not idolaters.

"Every intelligent Protestant on his first entering a Catholic church and witnessing the devotion of the people, must feel shocked, if at nothing else, at their prostrations before images."

Has the preacher ever been in a Roman Catholic church? Did he ever see the people prostrate before an image?[76] To say the very most we can in his favour, the preacher made a very serious mistake.

We now come to the conclusion of this tedious, and we did once hope unnecessary examination. Roman Catholics do make images of Jesus Christ, God the Son, but they only make the similitude of what was seen, a human body, in which the fulness of the divinity did dwell. Neither the reasoning nor the enactment prohibits this. This is an image, not an idol. They also make images of a dove, to signify the Holy Ghost, who once assumed that form; here they had a similitude.

"And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him." (*John* i. 32.)

"And lo! the heavens were open unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him." (*Matt.* iii. 16.)

"And he saw the heavens opened, and the spirit like a dove descending upon him." (*Mark* i. 10.)

"And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him." (*Luke* ii. 22.)

[76] Doubtless the learned author spoke here rather to the mind than to the words of his antagonist. Catholics do kneel, bow, and sometimes prostrate themselves before images, and in some cases these acts are directed by the ritual of the Church. It cannot be these external actions, therefore, of which the Bishop speaks; but he intends, rather, to repel the charge really meant by his adversary, viz.: that Catholics prostrate themselves before images to adore them.—See Council of Trent, Sess. 25. *De invocatione, et sacris imaginibus.*—I. A. B.

We stated that the commandment in *Deuteronomy* was given only to the Jewish people, and we now add only under the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed, coming out from an idolatrous nation, in the idolatry of which they had frequently joined, to which they were still prone, and going into the midst of very obstinate idolaters, who had more than once seduced them to sin. We shall show several facts which are exceptions to the reasoning principle found in the precept "you saw no similitude."

"So he drove out the man, and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life." (*Genesis* iii. 23.)

Many commentators state, but this is only an opinion, that Adam saw God if so, he must have seen a similitude.

"And the Lord appeared unto Abram. xvii. And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abraham. xviii. And the Lord appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre; and he sat at the tent door in the heat of the day; and he lifted up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood by him, and so forth.

"And the Lord said, because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and their sin is very grievous. I will now go down and see, and so forth.

"And the men turned their faces from thence, and went towards Sodom: but Abraham stood yet before the Lord.

"And the Lord went his way, as soon as he had left communing with Abraham. (*Gen.* xii. 7-33.)

"And there came two angels to Sodom at even; and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom, and seeing them rose up to meet them; and he bowed himself with his face towards the ground. (xix.)

"And the Lord appeared unto him (Isaac), and said, Go down into Egypt.

"And the Lord appeared unto him the same night, and said, I am the God of thy father Abraham, and so forth. (xxvi. 2, 24.)

"And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on earth, and the top of it reached heaven; and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it.

"And behold the Lord stood above it and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham," and so forth. (xxviii. 12, 13.)

We shall omit many others, and select a very few passages to show that subsequently, as well as previous to this special and particular precept, God did manifest himself in a similitude.

"Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left.

"And the Lord said, who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth Gilead; and one said on this manner, and another on that manner.

"And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord and said, I will persuade him," and so forth. (*I Kings al III Kings* xxii. 19-21.)

"In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high, and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.

"Above it stood the Seraphim: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain did he fly.

"And one cried unto another, and said Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." (*Isaiah* vi. 1-3).

"The heavens were opened, and I saw the visions of God."

"And above the firmament that was over their head was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it.

"And I saw as the colour of amber as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins, even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about."

"As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it I fell upon my face, and I heard the voice of one that spake." (*Ezekiel* i. 1-28.)

"I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the ancient of days did sit, whose garments were white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flames, and his wheels as burning fire.

"A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousands and thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened."

"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.

"And there was given to him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." (*Daniel* vii. 9-14.)

"Thus he showed me: and behold the Lord stood upon a wall made by plumbline, and a plumbline in his hand." (*Amos* vii. 7.)

Roman Catholics do not believe that they can, by any likeness, express the nature or figure of the God whom alone they adore. They know that from special circumstances special laws were given to the Israelites. The obligation of the law ceased with the circumstances which made it necessary. The law of *Deuteronomy* quoted in the text was one of this description; neither the reason nor the circumstances which once required its enactment now exist. It never had the extent which the preacher would give it. It is always unlawful to make or to retain idols. It is not unlawful to have images in churches. An image which had been useful may become injurious; it then ought to be removed; there is nothing of divinity or sanctity in the image, but there is a degree of public decency to be observed, and a degree of private feeling which it is lawful to indulge. What the Roman Catholic Chruch permits and requires for her images, does not exceed what the statute law of North Carolina permits and requires for the statue of General Washington. This state is not idolatrous.

SECTION XV.

DREADFUL CRIME—ABOMINABLE IDOLATRY.

What in the name of wonder has tempted the editor of the *Missionary* to insert the following extract in his paper for August 30, without a single remark to condemn the criminals? Was there no idolatry, no breach of what he calls the second commandment, in originally making and erecting this image? Were not these simple people permitted to practise gross idolatry? Was not this image to them at least an occasion of idolatry? O! when shall we see the land cleansed from the leaven of Popery?

"*Indian Anecdote.* One of the prettiest touches of feeling of which we have ever heard, was witnessed in the conduct of certain Indians from the interior, who some years ago visited our city. When the statue in the Hospital yard was pointed out to them as the figure of Miquon or William Penn, they all, with one consent, fell down on their knees before it—thus testifying in the strongest manner in their power, their reverence for the character of one of the few white men who have treated their race with humanity. It was not an exhibition got up for effect—it was the result of a burst of feeling—of a deeply implanted feeling which neither time nor distance had been able to eradicate. It had descended from father to son, had been cherished in the western wilds, and evinced itself in the midst of civilized society, by the strongest of natural signs of reverence."[11]—*Philadelphia Gazette.*

And all this is inserted without once reproving the crime, on the contrary, it appears to be related with approval. Whither has the genius of Iconoclasm fled? Why has not the mantle of Calvin descended upon his children?

In the same number of the same paper is the following editorial article:

"Our readers may form some idea of the horrible atrocities of the Inquisition, as it formerly existed, from the narrative of its recent operations, given in this paper. We wonder not that Catholics in this country should call it a mere political institution; but if it be not an engine made use of in Spain to purify the kingdom of all heretics, who dare doubt the infallibility of the Popish creed, as well as to punish the suspected enemies of the government, why have ecclesiastics been the chief instruments in perpetrating its enormous crimes? And why has it been confined to Catholic countries? One fact on this point is conclusive. The Inquisition has been sanctioned by the See of Rome—and Catholic priests, by virtue of their clerical office, have been appointed to preside over its guilty tribunals. It is in vain, then, for Catholics to affirm, that their Church is innocent of the unexampled tortures which it has inflicted, or unstained by the rivers of blood which it has caused to flow."

The Emerald, a newspaper published in New York, has, respecting the same article, the following editorial remark:

"*The Inquisition.*—The article on the Inquisition inserted in this day's *Emerald,*

[11] From the *Missionary* of August 30, 1824.

satisfactorily proves that that fearful instrument of tyranny is merely a political institution.''

Thus from the same premises will persons draw opposite conclusions.

But respecting the article itself, we unhestitatingly assert the entire to be a clumsy fabrication, not of the New York editor nor of the *Missionary*, but of the person or persons who got it up for Campbell's *London Monthly Magazine.*

But why would the *Missionary*, whose religion is, we believe, of the same kind as that which was originally established in New England, remind us of Witches? And if they convicted and punished witches in Spain, as the article states, about two centuries ago, they did the same in Scotland, and in Old England and in New England, at the same time. There was in each place an Inquisition according to the fashion of the place, and though burning a witch, according to the Spanish fashion, exhibits more of the blaze of cruelty, yet hanging her according to the New England fashion, was not one whit the less efficacious.

We find the following to be the most severe sentence in the entire article:

''M. M———, whose name is identified with the revival of the Spanish drama, and with its reputation, was the first writer who corrected the opinions of his countrymen in regard to the transactions of this tribunal. He published in 1809, accompanied with notes, full of judgment and spirit, the account of an *Auto da fe*, which had been celebrated at Logrado, two centuries before, and the particulars of which had been printed there at the time. This report, drawn up by the order and under the inspection of the Holy Office itself, forms the most complete accusation that could be exhibited against that body. It presents an abstract of all that human depravity and the accumulated ignorance of ages can engender. Unhappy women slowly consumed by fire, for having been convicted of sorcery—grave remarks on the Devil, and his adventures in gallantry with these poor tortured females—express details, as revolting to reason as to decency—things, in short, so horribly inconsistent as to render it incredible that they could have been written or uttered by any but madmen; these, and such as these, are the contents of the work now alluded to. On this occasion, the king (Joseph Bonaparte) commissioned the Canon Llorente, who had been, during a long time, Secretary to the Holy Office at Toledo, and was, moreover, well acquainted with the history of his country, [and who] found himself admirably situated for the execution of such a task. His famous work, formed upon these records which he collected, deserves to be considered as an important service rendered to humanity, however destitute it may be of style or philosophical connexion. That hideous monster, the Inquisition, is there displayed in all its naked horror.''

Now, with the difference above specified, we ask, would not this suit any of those places, where pure Christianity was dominant at the same period?

The article proceeds to state:

"It must be borne in mind, however, that the Spanish Inquisition, as described in the writings of M. M——— and Llorente, and as constituted from the time of Ferdinand V. to the end of the reign of Charles II., is not exactly the same with that existing in 1808. Its name, indeed, remained to excite feelings of abhorrence; but the venom of its nature was, in effect, nearly exhausted. Feebleness is the necessary result of age; and the Inquisition had grown old by the lapse of three centuries. Charles III., moreover, the most truly religious monarch that Spain has ever known, had given a considerable check to its influence; and, from that period, the council of Castile, by continued opposition, had gradually wrested from it the chief portion of its privileges."

This piece then tells us, that now it is a mere political engine. But, mark one of its assertions. After a number of details, which are manifest falsehoods, we read:

"We cannot refrain from noting down here the famous mandate of M. Mier y Campillo, the Inquisitor-General, which was read in every church in Spain on the first Sunday in Lent, 1815:—'His Excellency, the Grand Inquisitor, enjoins all confessors, under pain of excommunication, to denounce at the Holy Office such persons as may have confessed themselves to belong to the order of Freemasonry!' Is it possible for baseness to proceed farther than this? Yes; several professors were found to comply with the order of his excellency!! The king took an undisguised part in all these infamies, and appointed judges belonging to the criminal tribunals, to aid in the inquisitorial examinations."

Here are two palpable absurdities: First, that the Inquisitor-General ordered the confessors to tell the confessions of their penitents! ! ! Now, the Catholic Church teaches, and every Roman Catholic knows, that all the power that could be adduced, would not justify, would not palliate the crime of a confessor who would divulge any part of such confession to any person; for it would be a violation of divine law, of ecclesiastical law, and of the natural law of contracts; for the contract is, I will confess only upon your being bound to everlasting and total secrecy. Next, mark the folly of the case exhibited. In the beginning of Lent, it is published and known, that confessors must inform the Inquisitor who have confessed themselves to be Freemasons; yet those persons go to those confessors and tell them, knowing that the confessor must tell the Inquisitor, and the Inquisitor will seize them; and he gravely tells us, some of them did tell the priests, and were taken up. Now, was any human being so besotted as the Inquisitor who published in the church the directions, when, if he chose, he might, through the bishops, have privately sent the mandate? Were any persons more besotted than the men who took the trouble of going to the priests? Why not go at once into the prison of the Inquisition? Yet the men who publish this, tell us they know our religion!

SECTION XVI.

We have had much of our time occupied in correcting the misstatements of our doctrine, as given by this writer. In a late number, he misrepresented our doctrine regarding images. We supposed he would have had the honesty to give our corrections; but, no: not an allusion even. His readers do not see our publication; he does not give our answers. He is himself bent on concealing the truth. It would then be ridiculous for us to waste more of our time upon such useless explanation. He may henceforth, if he pleases so to do, continue to distort, to garble, to misrepresent. We shall probably leave him undisturbed in his inglorious work.

We have avoided entering upon any doctrinal controversy with him. He wished to attack, and did attack us upon the doctrine of church infallibility. We avoided the controversy as useless. He now attacks us upon the doctrine of transubstantiation. We believe the doctrine, but will not now enter upon the controversy which he desires to provoke.

A correspondent of his attacks the same doctrine, and takes up one of the arguments which he alleges was used by the Bishop of this Diocess in its support. Here, too, we leave him a clear field. But he calls upon the Bishop for the fulfilment of a pledge made by us:

"In his controversy with the *Missionary,* the Bishop has also said, that if it could be made to appear that one council had condemned the decisions of another, he would renounce his religion. Then the good Bishop must renounce either his religion, or the credit of a Catholic historian. (*Fleury,* ix. 580:) 'Alcuin, an Englishman and an abbot, declared himself against image-worship; and a council at Frankfort held the same opinion, and condemned the decision of the second Nicene Council.' I could adduce from Fleury, Cave, and others, many similar instances of conflicting councils and popes. If in any of my foregoing remarks I have seemed severe, let it be remembered that it has been fairly provoked by the magisterial arrogance which the Bishop has assumed, in speaking of the intelligent and liberal denominations of Protestants in this section of the United States. He has been kindly received, and his ministerial credentials liberally acknowledged, by many communities to which it is a sorry requital, to represent them as under the influence of a system of lies and fabrications.

"*Ratio.*"

The allegation of the Bishop's stating that they were under the influence of a system of lies and fabrications, if it has any meaning, must mean that the Bishop makes a very bad return to those who have treated him kindly, because, when they say, we have been informed that your church teaches this abominable doctrine, the Bishop has been so rude as to say, "My good friends, you have been deceived: they who make such assertions do not write or speak truth, for our church teaches no such doctrine; this is a fabrication." Base ingratitude! !

As to the council contradicting a council, we leave the *Missionary* to testify that our gage is still our own.

"With respect to the challenge which Ratio notices, we also feel disposed to offer a few remarks.

"The Bishop, we presume, will not deny the conflicting opinions of different councils, but will atempt to evade the force of Ratio's remarks on that subject, by denying the application of general, to one or the other of those councils, in which these conflicting opinions are apparent; or, if he acknowledges both to be general, he will contend that their conflicting opinions did not respect an article of faith; at any rate, he will not be at a loss for a manœuvre to effect his escape. It is only the authority of a general council which the Bishop acknowledges, and his pledge is given to renounce the Roman Catholic religion, only when it can be found that one general council has reversed the decisions of another general council on an article of faith."

Now to the facts. There was no general council of Frankfort; Alcuin's faith was the same as that of the fathers of the second Council of Nice.

Vague assertions are no proof. Let the canon of one general council, and the canon of another general council, be placed side by side. We hold to our pledge; the Bishop authorizes us to say he joins in the bond.

But the gentleman who writes letters for the *Missionary*, is extremely courteous. Take two specimens:

"I use the phraseology, Roman Catholic, in conformity with custom, and not in accordance with my own views; because I think the word Catholic ought long ago to have been rescued from such a degrading restriction as that is, which it is here made to endure, in reference to only one division of the Christian Church, and that by no means the purest.

"I should be among the first to rejoice at the reformation of a corrupt church, and should conceive, with all deference, that it is a favourable time for the papists of the United States to commence the work of reformation; because common sense ought to teach them, that in this land of free inquiry and moral intelligence, the old cankered root of papacy cannot grow. Should they boldly renounce the errors of their forefathers, and abjure the pernicious tenets of the dark ages, should they subject all their creed to the rigid test of Scripture fairly expounded, and reserve only what is good in the ancient formularies, they might become a respectable church. But, instead of this salutary system of expurgation, they are preaching up the thousand times refuted errors of the middle ages, and demanding credit for the spurious dogmas of a church built upon tradition, or anything else than Jesus Christ, and the doctrine of the Apostles."

Who now will be so foolhardy as to deny that the Bishop of this corrupt church, who plants this cankered root of Papacy, who preaches the thousand times refuted errors of the middle ages, who demands credit for spurious dogmas, built upon anything else but Jesus Christ, that this Bishop who preaches the pernicious tenets of a dark age, ought to feel so grateful to this polite gentleman, as to allow him, without contradiction, to publish to the good people of Georgia, that the said Bishop

teaches doctrines which he, the aforesaid Bishop, condemns, merely because the people have been kind to him? Indeed he must be a most ungrateful Bishop! Fie! upon him! Good people of Georgia, if ever this wicked man should go amongst you again, treat him with incivility, because he had endeavoured quietly to show you that his church was not as bad as some liars said it was.

Well may our friend the *Missionary* exclaim, "save me from my friends." What means the following passage from his highly respectable source?

"I have been not a little amused, but more indignant at the strange course which the dispute has assumed at different times, betwixt the *Missionary* and the *Miscellany*. When the former had, as I thought, arranged his facts in such order, and fortified them with such authority as to give them every promise of effect, the crafty antagonist, by some unexpected deflection of his body, eludes the attack, and stands sneering at his honest adversary, behind some inscrutable rampart of ecclesiastical defence: *Scelerato profuit ara.* Again, when the former has presented the clear and broad truths of history in such a forcible light, as to make evasion impossible, his dexterous opponent, seizing roughly the facts which he could not deny, has smothered the cry of some, and impaled others upon the point of a syllogism. His method of ratiocination he sometimes borrows from the saints; and, when these do not minister to his purpose, he scruples not to obtain help from a less holy source: *Flectere si nequeo superos Acheronta movebo.* It can be neither safe nor profitable to contend with an adversary of such subtle powers. To one accustomed to the rectitude of sound logic, it would be an endless fatigue to pursue him through all the meanderings of sophistical lubricity; and I have come to the determination to take a lesson from Protagoras, who has taught us, *Quanam verborum industria causa infirmior fortior fieret,* before I can pretend to engage in a controversy with him."

Now, blessings on his indignation! How prettily he quotes Latin, too! Well, we shall imitate him: *In vino veritas*, which we imitate thus, "a drunken man tells truth," and so does an indignant man, for neither has the cunning to conceal it. The truth then is, that we argued better than he expected. Shall we teach him our secret? We had the right side; and as we do not wish to wear undeserved honours, we must decline his compliment and fairly avow, that if we had the other side, the *Missionary* would have foiled us long since, because after truth would have been exhausted, our ammunition would have been expended: but he had another resource. Shall we give a specimen? In his last number, the *Missionary* says:

"Another twist they take, is this, that general councils may differ with respect to the rules and regulations of the church, but not in anything which respects an article of faith. If they define faith as we have heard the Bishop define it, viz., doing what God tells them to do, they have either differed with regard to an article of faith, as in the case of images, or God has told them to do things diametrically opposed to each other, or that the reverence they are bound to pay to images is a mere regulation of the church, which has no connexion with faith."

Now, the Bishop desires us to say that the editor of the *Missionary* never heard him define faith to be doing what God tells them to do. The editor states that he never heard the Bishop, except at Warrenton. On that occasion the Bishop said, as he still says, All religion may be reduced to this principle, believe God when he speaks to you—this is faith; and obey God when he commands you—this is morality. And in the report of the Bishop's discourse, as given by the editor himself, we find the following passage:

"With respect to the principles of his church, he observed they held but one, and that was doing what God told them to do. This principle he divided into three branches: God has told us to believe—We believe. God has told us to practise—We practise. God has told us to adhere to certain ordinances—We adhere to them."

Thus, it is plain that the Bishop did not define faith as he asserts, and it is plain that the writer knew the Bishop did not,—because he gave what is incompatible with his assertion.

In those passages, the editor of the *Missionary* draws upon a stock which we would not use; and he not only attributes to Dr. England what he never said, but he contradicts himself.

Now, we give a little passage, in which he says what we believe he did not mean to say:

"The two former alternatives they will doubtless reject. The question then turns upon the latter. We shall assume the fact as proved, that councils have held conflicting opinions respecting the worship of images. The true state of the question, then, is plainly this. The canon respecting images is either an article of faith, or it is not. To be extremely charitable towards them, we must take the latter part of the alternative, and allow that it is not an article of faith; for we are sure that God has never told them, except through tradition, that images ought to receive even a relative worship."

He says he is sure God has never told us, except through tradition, that images ought to receive relative worship. This distinctly means, that he is sure that God did tell us, through tradition, that images ought to receive relative worship. Then God did tell us so. Now, if God did tell us so, it is undoubtedly an article of faith. And he who refuses to believe and to practise accordingly, refuses to believe and to practice according to the revealed will of God. This is distinctly the meaning of his words; but we will not write differently from what we think, and we avow our belief, that the meaning of his mind contradicts the meaning of his words. The honest man may go to his friend Ratio for a little more consolation; for though we have neither impaled him upon a syllogism, nor bent our body to evade his blow, we only exhibit him as every person who has a bad cause is sure to be found, sinking under his difficulties. We do not blame him, we pity him. He has ability enough,—and if he had our side of the question, and we his, we would not be as

safe as he is, for his armour is only battered, and he has not received above a score or two of gashes. We would, under his hand, be bleeding in every limb, and have our bones beaten to a mummy. We repeat it, the fault is not in the writer. He made as much of a bad case as could be made of it; whatever opinion we may hold of his principles, we must respect his talents.

In a subsequent paragraph he complains that we omit the second commandment. O! no, indeed! that we do not. He only mistakes the special recapitulations of the first for the second, and we divide them in the old-fashioned way. Omit a commandment! O! no, we will not; he need have no fears on that score. Neither will we throw away any books of the Sacred Scripture, nor call them apocryphal because they contain what condemns our errors; we will keep the whole, Maccabees and all. However, he has made a discovery. The poor North American Indians are all idolaters. Yet they have no idols, except such as good folks of the Reformed Religion made and set up for them.

"Would it have been anything new, if we had told the world that the aborigines of this country are generally idolaters? Their idolatry, it is true, may not be so refined as that which exists in some more polished nations, yet there are other objects which they worship besides the Great Spirit. It is impossible for us to tell what passed in these poor Indian's minds when they knelt at the statue of Penn. They might have supposed that it was made for the express purpose of being worshipped. They might, in their imagination, have deified the benefactor of their forefathers, and supposed that his spirit was hovering around his image. In the profoundest veneration of their hearts they might have paid him that homage which was due only to their God; or it might have been as the editor of the *Philadelphia Gazette*—who, we believe, is a Catholic—has considered it, a mere testimony of their reverence for the character of Penn. In this last sense we were willing to view it, until the *Miscellany* impliedly acknowledged a similarity between this act of the Indians, and one of the rites of his own church. But, perhaps, this similarity will extend further than he will wish to trace it."

He then tells us, that in Mexico the Indians made a god of bread and honey, and eat it, therefore they were just as good worshippers of gods of bread as we are. All this, of course, is very fine. But why was this image-worship of Penn allowed? Why is this idol still kept in that city? Why is the idol of George Washington kept in Raleigh? We presume it was not the Catholic editor of the *Philadelphia Gazette* who set up this idol of William Penn to afford the occasion of sin to the children of the forest. Why not destroy those idols, and purify the land from the abomination of idolatry?

SECTION XVII.

We before stated that we would not enter into any doctrinal controversy with the editor of [the *Missionary*], if it was in our power to avoid so doing. In one of his papers he published a sort of comment upon a text of the book of Exodus, in which he asserted that our veneration of images, and so forth, was exactly the same sort of idolatry as that of the heathens. We did not enter into any controversy upon the propriety or impropriety of the practice, nor respecting the truth or falsehood of our doctrine—but we did, in two essays, show that the idolatry of the heathens, and that which was condemned in the Scriptures, was not the same as our veneration of images. The *Missionary* republished, at our request, in his number for October 4, our first part, which appeared on August 25, in No. 8, and rejoins upon us in the following remarks of which we make a hasty review.

Now be it remembered that our object is not to prove the correctness of our doctrines nor to defend them; we say doctrine, for in this article a very wide range is taken by our assailant, and instead of confining himself to the mere and single question of whether our veneration of images was exactly the same as pagan idolatry, he takes in the questions of the veneration of saints, of the praying to saints, of having saints for patrons, and of making pilgrimages to the tombs of saints and other holy places. Instead of attempting to answer our arguments or to disprove any of the statements of fact, he only pours forth a new flood of misrepresentation.

Be it then remembered that our object is not to defend those doctrines, nor any of them, but to show that our adversary is guilty of vague quibbling, contradicts himself, makes false statements, misrepresents our doctrines, and can scarcely be excused from blasphemy.

Our first charge is that he quibbles upon vague expressions. An honest man always endeavours to have precise notions attached to distinct words, so that he may the more easily arrive at truth; a dishonest man endeavours to make his phraseology loose and vague, that he may be able to escape by subterfuges. Hence an honest man defines as closely as possible the meaning of words, and ascertains as closely as he can the nature of things.

Our definition of idolatry is "the giving to any creature that honour which is due to God alone"—by the word creature we mean anything which is created, of course giving to angels, to saints, amongst whom we rank the blessed Virgin, to images or to anything else, the honour which is due to God alone, would be idolatry.

The heathens gave this honour to many gods, to devils and not to God, to idols of different compositions, therefore they were idolaters. Roman Catholics do not give it to angels, to saints, to images, to any creatures, therefore they are not idolaters. Such was our argument. How does he answer it?

"'Idolatry,' as Gilbert, Bishop of Sarum, very justly observes, 'is a general word which comprehends many several sorts and ranks of sins under it. As lying is capable of many degrees, from an officious lie to the swearing falsely, against the life of an innocent man, in judgment; the one is the lowest, and the other is the highest act of that kind; but all are lying, and yet it would appear an unreasonable thing to urge everything that is said of an act in general, and which belongs to the highest acts of it, as if all the inferior degrees did necessarily involve the guilt of the highest.'

"If it were necessary to consider the derivation of the word, we could show that idolatry signifies that worship of religious service which is paid to an image or representation, whether corporeal or mental. There is no dispute with regard to the idolatry of the heathen. They make images and they worship them. Their vain imaginations have created gods which have no existence, and to these gods they pay their vows and offer their supplications. Roman Catholics also make images and worship them."

Thus by avoiding to tell us what idolatry is, and making his phraseology vague and indistinct, he quibbles, with the appearance of argument but without substance. As there are several degrees of lying, so there may be several degrees of idolatry. To us this has no distinct meaning. Let us try to find some mode of making it distinct. What is a lie? An untrue statement knowingly made. There may be many degrees of lies. True, but each lie must be a false statement knowingly made. So there may be many degrees of idolatry. True, but each degree must be giving to a creature the honour due to the Creator alone. If this was Bishop Burnet's meaning, if this is the *Missionary's* meaning, we give them the full benefit of their comparison, and their vague quibble will leave us untouched, until they can show that we give to a creature the honour due to God alone. The heathens were guilty of doing so, the Roman Catholics were not, are not.

In like manner he quibbles upon the word worship. If by worship is meant the honour due to God only, we worship God and worship no other; the dispute is not about the word, but about the act. In Great Britain the bench of magistrates is worshipful, the chairman is your worship. The officers of several societies in America, as well as Great Britain, are worshipful. What would be said of us, if we charged all those good Protestants at both sides of the Atlantic with being idolaters?

We accuse him of contradicting himself. He asserts that in paganism, most of the heathens believed in one supreme God, and many subor-

dinate gods; of course then the divinity resided only in one, the others being subordinate. He quotes Celsus, from Origen, to prove that the pagans were not polytheists. His own expressions are, "The advocates for paganism also pretended that the worship which they paid their idols was relative, being ultimately referred to the supreme God. We quoted, it is true, Arnobius only to prove that fact." Now the quotation from Arnobius was not quoted to prove that the adoration was ultimately referred to the supreme God. The words quoted by him were *quod per ea Dii invisibiles honorentur.* Gods. Thus when he quotes Arnobius, he proves the adoration was given to many gods, not to only one supreme God. Yet now he contradicts this, and tells us it is only one supreme God. If he had not correctly translated it we might have suspected his ignorance of grammar, but from the version he has given, the blame must lie elsewhere; he has proved that he knew the difference between the singular number, *Deus,* and the plural *Dii.*

"But they tell us it is a relative worship. The advocates for paganism also pretended that the worship which they paid to their idols was relative, being ultimately referred to the supreme God. We quoted, it is true, only Arnobius, to prove the fact, not for the want of other testimony to that effect. Celsus, as Origen informs us. (lib. 7, *Contra Celsum,*) reasoned thus: ' 'Who believes that our idols are so many gods? They are only so many symbols of the Divinity, and we do not adore them but in honour of God.' If the *Miscellany* needs more testimony on this subject, we will refer him to Porphyry (*Euseb.* præp. ev. l. 3, c. 7), Maximus Tyrius (*Diss.* 38), and Julian (*Frag.* ap. Euseb. præp. ev. l. 4, c. 2), all of whom told the fathers plainly that they did not believe that the Godhead was like their images, or was shut up with them, but they only used them as helps to their imagination and apprehension, that from thence they might form suitable thoughts of the Deity. These images were also erected, *propter indomitum atque imperitum vulgus,* for the ungovernable and ignorant multitude, as a salutary restraint upon them—as the means of exciting their devotion, and of softening and reforming their rude and unlettered minds. The same arguments have been used by Roman Catholics for that 'due honour and veneration' which the Council of Trent requires to be paid to the images of Christ and the saints.

"But we are told that this reasoning is not conclusive, because the cases are not parallel. 'The heathen worshipped many gods. Roman Catholics worship only one God.' Most of the heathens have believed in one supreme God, and many subordinate gods."

He labours to show, without proving as he ought, that which we have before disproved, viz., that the heathens did not adore many gods,—that they did not adore the very idols. We quoted the very author, Arnobius, whom he selected. The heathen deities were opposed to each other: Juno quarrelled with Jupiter; Venus and Juno contended, as his correspondent Ratio could tell him, in his pretty Latin quotations. We

may expect to be told that our saints and angels do the same. However, the subject is too serious for a joke.

Again he contradicts himself. In his first piece he writes of Catholics:

"Though he may be well assured that they consider these images in no other respect capable of profiting them than by putting them in mind of the great atoning sacrifice."

Again he writes:

"Now Catholics do not ask their images to bless them, for they know they are nothing more than gold or silver, or wood."

This was stating our doctrine correctly, but in his last piece he writes:

"Roman Catholics pray to the Cross."

And again:

"They may talk of relative worship as much as they please, but it is absolute *Latria*, that is, the highest worship that can be paid to God himself, according to Bellarmine and Thomas of Aquin, which is paid to the cross; and as one very properly observes, the *crucis latria* must be *idolatria*, (the worship of the cross must be the worship of an idol)."

We forgive him for his bad Latin; indeed there is no such Latin word as *idolatria*. But he has contradicted himself.

We now proceed to show his falsehoods and misrepresentations.

"The subordinate gods were considered as having a share in the administration and government of the world, and as being the patrons of particular places and particular arts. How near the Roman Catholics have copied them in the character which they have given to their saints, we shall attempt to show.

"In the Church of Rome, God is represented under the form of an old man—the Trinity by three faces, rising one out of another—St. Peter, with keys—St. Michael, like old Mercury, gathering the souls together, and conducting them with a wand—St. John, with a chalice—St. James, with the shells of fishes—St. Paul, with a sword—St. Cecelia, with a harp—St. Patrick, with serpents—St. Gertrude, with rats—Thaumaturgus, with a mountain on his shoulders—Moses, with horns—Anthony, of Padua, with a mallet in his hand, pounding the heads of heretics. And this catalogue of the attitudes and postures which they give their images, might be swelled to an indefinite length. But the heathens before them had represented Saturn under the figure of an old man, with a scythe in his hand—Annubis, or Mercury, the door-keeper, with two faces, a key, a wand, and a serpent—Orpheus, with a harp—Atlas, with a mountain on his shoulders—Apollo, with a spear, killing the dragon—Vulcan, with a hammer—and all the other gods with emblems made in perfect accordance with their vain imaginations. These facts show that, in the Roman Catholic Church, there is at least an approximation to idolatry. But when we consider the veneration which is paid to these images, we are totally at a loss for a word in which to express it, if it is not embraced under the general head of idolatry."

God is represented under the form of an old man by the prophet *Daniel*, vii. 9, and so forth; also by *St. John*, in *Revelation* iv. "The Trinity by three faces." This is a mistake, or worse: at all events it is

not true. St. Peter with keys (*Matthew* xvi 19); St. Michael like old Mercury, and so forth. A mistake or worse. "St. John with a chalice," (*Matthew* xx. 23.) "St. James with shells of fishes." It is a part of our religion in which we have not been previously instructed; we therefore take the liberty of making it "a mistake, or worse." St. Paul with a sword, because he was beheaded with a sword on the Ostian road, near Rome, on the 29th of June, 66. St. Cecelia with a harp, because, like David, with her vocal and instrumental music, she praised the God of Heaven. St. Patrick with serpents. It would be well if he should send them out of Georgia. "St. Gertrude with rats." A mistake, or worse. Thaumaturgus with a mountain on his shoulders. This is a mistake, or worse. "Moses with horns." A mistake or worse; they are rays of light. (*Exodus* xxxiv. 29, and so forth.) Anthony was called *malleus hereticorum*, and probably might have been painted so. This was the painter's taste, not a part of our religion in each case.

It is not our province to teach this writer either language or mythology; but one would imagine he ought to have sufficient prudence not to expose his ignorance. He appears to know as little of pagan deities as he does of our religion; yet he has the hardihood to write of both, and to compare two systems, upon each of which he is equally destitute of correct information. Anubis was an Egyptian god, and had but one head and one face, and no key. Mercury was not the doorkeeper, but the messenger of the gods; he was not painted with two faces—he was not painted with a key. Atlas was not painted with a mountain, but with the heavens. Apollo was not painted with a spear. The next mistakes, or worse, are:

"Roman Catholics invoke their saints as occasion requires. St. Sebastian and St. Roch to cure the plague; St. Petronilla, the fever; St. Apollonia, the toothache; St. Valentine, the falling sickness, and so forth. The heathens also invoked Apollo to cure the plague, Hercules the falling sickness, and so on."

Now it is no part of our religion to invoke any of the above-named saints for any of the above-named purposes; there is no principle of our church which requires it, nor do we know that any Roman Catholic ever did make such invocation. Mr. Tooke does not inform us that Hercules was invoked to cure the falling sickness; and we as yet look upon him to be much superior authority to the *Missionary*.

"The heathens had their tutelary or patron gods. Osiris and Isis were the patrons of Egypt; Apollo, of Rhodes and Delphos; Jupiter Capitolonius, Mars, and Quirinus, of Rome; Dianna, of Ephesus, and so forth. The same is practised in the Church of Rome. Michael and Dennis are the protectors of France; St. James is the patron of Spain; Martin and Boniface of Germany; Patrick of Ireland, and so forth."

Look to *Daniel* x. 13, 20, and 21; xii.; also to *Exodus* xxiii. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and see that the God of Israel commands the people to obey the angel, under whose protection he places them, at the same time that he warns them against idolatry. Also *Exodus* xxxiii. 2. We do not quote these passages now to prove doctrine, for we do not enter upon the controversy, but to show that it is a misrepresentation of fact to state that Roman Catholics have taken up the practices of heathens, when in truth they have taken up the practices of the purest days of the Jewish Church, sanctioned by God, in accordance with the great principles of religion, not of ritual law.

"Arnobius reproaches the heathens with making artisans and tradesmen of their gods. Thus, one was a shepherd, another a cowherd, and another a smith. In the Catholic Church, St. Anthony is a swineherd, St. Crispin a shoemaker, St. Guzman a tailor, and St. Leonard a locksmith."

In no Catholic country, nor in any other country, do Roman Catholics believe that the saints in Heaven work at their trades or occupations; as Arnobius, whom the *Missionary* would adduce as a witness, that the pagans worshipped [their idols] only relatively to the supreme God, tells us the pagans believe concerning Vulcan, and their deities. We believe this is now the twentieth falsehood of this virulent article. But Roman Catholics believe that Heaven is attainable to the most humble labourer, equally as to the greatest emperor; for Jesus Christ our Saviour made no distinction between rich and poor, when he shed his blood for all. We are sorry to be obliged to reprove the aristocratic spirit of this wretched sarcasm. This does not manifest the spirit of republicanism.

"The Heathens prayed to their idols. Roman Catholics pray to the cross, to the virgin Mary, and to the saints. In the hymn, they sing to the crucifix, they have these words: *O Crux ave spes unica...auge piis justitiam reisque dona veniam.* The cross is here saluted with—'Hail! long may you live and prosper.' It is called our 'only hope.' It is invoked to 'increase our righteousness,' and to 'forgive our sins.' If a stick of wood or a stone can be our only hope, can increase our righteousness, and forgive our sins, what need have we of a living mediator at the throne of God? They may talk of relative worship as much as they please, but it is absolute *latria*, the highest worship that can be paid to God himself, according to Bellarmine and Thomas of Aquin, which is paid to the cross; and as one very properly observes, the *crucis latria*, must be *idolatria*—(The worship of the cross must be the worship of an idol.) No matter by what scholastic name it may be called, whether inferior, relative or analogical worship, it is worship still; nor will these mitigating terms weaken in the least, the force of the second commandment. As the theft will be theft, whether it be called absolute or relative, or be performed for this or that end, so are the salutations, genuflexions, prostrations, lighting candles, burning incense, and prayers to images, acts that have at least an idolatrous tendency, whatever distinction the learned may make between absolute and relative worship. Thus the parity between the wor-

ship, which the Heathens pay to their idols, and Roman Catholics to their images is evident, notwithstanding the former are Polytheists, and the latter, Theists. If the one paid a relative worship, so did the other."

In this there is contradiction and falsehood: because, if Roman Catholics give the cross the worship of *latria*, they pay to it the honour due to God only, and they are therefore Polytheists, yet the writer says they are not Polytheists, but only Theists or worshippers of one God only. Falsehood, because neither Bellarmine nor Thomas of Aquin say, that the cross ought to receive *latria*; nor do Catholics pay that worship to it, either relatively or absolutely. The passage is from the hymn sung in our church on the commemoration of the passion of our Saviour, and the prayers are addressed to Jesus Christ our Lord who suffered upon the cross, and not to the cross itself, which, as the *Missionary* acknowledges, that same St. Thomas said in his *Summa*, we know to be wood which could not help us.

"In the Arian controversy, the fathers considered those who denied the divinity of Christ, idolaters, for paying the same external worship to Christ that they did to God; and no small ingenuity was exhibited in attempting to remove the charge, which was so legitimately fastened upon them. But if, in the opinion of the fathers, the Arians were idolaters, in what light would they have viewed the angels many, and the saints many, of the Roman Catholic Church? Modern Popery, we know, has put off many of its grosser features; but even among the most polished writers, and in the most polished countries, where it prevails, its real texture appears through the gloss with which it is covered. M. Chateaubriand, for instance, has frequent passages of this kind: 'Does the believer suffer? He prays to his little image and is comforted. Does he want the return of his relative or his friend? He makes a vow and takes the pilgrim's staff; he springs over the Alps or the Pyrenees, and visits our lady at Loretto, or St. James in Gallicia. He prostrates himself, he prays the saint to restore him his son, (perhaps a poor sailor boy wandering on the seas,) to prolong his father's days, or to raise his good wife from a bed of sickness. His heart is lightened—He returns to his hut—Covered with shells, he makes his hamlet echo with his conch, and in wild and tender notes, he chaunts the condescension of Mary, the mother of God.'—*Genie du Christianisme*, tom. ii., page 334."

We must defer our comment on this to our next.

SECTION XVIII.

Again, let us remind our readers, that with these persons we have not entered upon a doctrinal controversy, nor do we intend to enter upon it. We have confined ourselves to a mere exposition of their untruths regarding our tenets, and respecting facts.

In our last examination of the statements of the editor, we omitted to remark upon his quotation from Mr. Chateaubriand, which showed

a man "praying to his image." First, Mr. Chateaubriand is not a general council, nor an authorized catechism. But we will be told he is a good witness. Let us then see his testimony. He testifies that Roman Catholics pray to images. The *Missionary* has suppressed a material part of the evidence. The author has the passage in his chapter on popular devotions, moral harmonies, and he commences thus: "In the first class must be placed those popular devotions which consist in certain opinions and certain rites, practised by the multitude, though neither enjoined nor absolutely prohibited by the church. They are, in fact, but harmonies of religion and nature. When the common people fancy that they hear the voices of the dead in the winds; when they talk of nocturnal apparitions; when they undertake pilgrimages to obtain relief from their afflictions; it is evident that these opinions are only affecting relations between certain scenes of nature, certain sacred doctrines, and the sorrows of our hearts." Thus Mr. Chateaubriand testifies that it is no more an act of religion to pray to an image than to fancy that we hear the voices of the dead in the winds. Can he be an honest writer who thus endeavours to delude by garbling? Besides Mr. C. did not write what is the fact, for the church does absolutely prohibit any persons praying to images; because it would be idolatry and is prohibited by God, by reason, and by the church, which only repeats the prohibition of God and of reason. To save our own and our readers' time, we now beg to state that we shall not consider ourselves called upon henceforth to notice quotations from works which are not considered of authority.

Upon the following collection of glaring untruth and misrepresentation, we shall not waste a word. We only exhibit it to our readers as a specimen of the substitution for argument with which we are assailed.

"In our last we considered the parity between the worship which heathens pay to their images, and that which Roman Catholics pay to their idols, and show that in both cases only a relative worship was pretended. We might have proceeded much farther and shown from their own authorized works—works which have passed the solemn ordeal, and been declared by the guardians of the church to contain 'nothing contrary to faith and morals,' that on one occasion it is required that the Virgin Mary shall receive ten times as much praise as the God of Heaven. At least ten *Ave Marias* are required for one *Pater Noster*. If the *Miscellany* has ever read *Albertus Magnus* and *Bonaventure*, he can hardly have the countenance to complain that Protestants have misrepresented his church with respect to the worship which is paid to the Virgin; for they have parodied the Bible in such a manner as richly to deserve the broad epithet of blasphemy. They introduce the name of Mary, where the Holy Spirit has placed the ineffable name of Jehovah; and this is not incidentally done, for it runs through the whole body of the Psalter and the Bible which they have composed to her praise.

"The fifteenth chapter of *Exodus* reads thus:

" 'Let us sing to our glorious Lady, the Virgin Mary: Our Lady is Almighty, her name is next to God. She has thrown into the sea the chariots of Pharaoh and his host. O Lady, thou hast delivered my soul from the lion.'

"'*Isaiah* 12. I will sing to thee, O Lady of Israel, for thou hast comforted me. My Lady is my Saviour, I trust in thee and will not fear.'

" '*Psalm* 51. Have mercy on me, O Lady, mother of mercies, and according to the bowels of thy compassion make me clean from all my iniquities; pour thy grace upon me and withdraw not thy usual mercies from me.'

"In *Genesis* she is the truth of the altar which Noah built, and the sacrifice which he offered. She was also the ladder which Jacob saw. In *Exodus* she is the mercy-seat and the altar of burnt-offerings. In *Leviticus* and *Numbers*, she is the ark of the covenant, the rock from whence the water flowed, and the star that Balaam saw.

"These books have been authorized, why have they not been condemned? The false principle upon which they build forbids it, for they cannot now condemn them without giving up the infallibility of the church. And yet such blasphemous works are permitted to send abroad a baleful influence, which Protestants are censured in attempting to check."

To all this we answer by a reference in our Bibles to the places quoted, and next, neither of those writers taught such doctrines. And again, Roman Catholics are neither required nor permitted to worship images, or the blessed Virgin Mary, or any other Saint; worship, in the meaning of the word here, is by them paid to God alone.

After this comes a paragraph to prove that the sacrifice of the Mass is like the unbloody sacrifice of Numa Pompilius, and asserting what is not a fact, that Catholics worship bread and wine, and then nearly a column to insist that the Israelites were not guilty of polytheism, but of idolatry in worshipping the Lord God under the likeness of a calf, and so forth, and of course that Roman Catholics are equally idolaters. To examine this position would be to enter upon a doctrinal controversy, in which we shall not now engage. We have explained the fact as to our doctrine; we have exhibited the false statements of our opponents; we have done.

His last paragraph relating to the Israelites is thus:

"Now, if they could celebrate a feast to Jehovah, the true God, and yet worship the calf, in what, we ask again, consists the difference between the worship which was paid to the calf and that which is authorized in the Roman Catholic Church? They praised the calf for the wonders which it had performed. Roman Catholics praise the relics, and tombs, and statues of their saints for the miracles which they have done. And though neither of them have cast off the worship of Jehovah, yet both have degraded the simple institutions of God, and must, according to the plain letter of divine revelation, be considered idolaters."

In this there is a mistake, or worse. Roman Catholics do not praise the relics, or tombs, or statues of their saints, for the miracles which

they have done; nor do they believe a miracle can be done by any relic, or tomb, or statue, or saint, but by God alone. He may use instruments, or occasional causes, if he will, but the miracle is his peculiar work, though it may be done by an instrument. Thus they were not the bones but God that wrought the miracle of which we read in *II* or *IV Kings*, xiii. 21.

The writer, who assumes the signature of Ratio, gives about a column and a half to prove that Dr. England asserted what was not true in stating "that the doctrine of transubstantiation was never questioned from the time of the Apostles up to the tenth century." We beg to remark that our object is not now to enter upon a discussion of the grounds of that doctrine, nor to enter at any length upon the proof of our own assertions; but to make a simple statement of a fact. The writer has the following passage:

"To show that I do not charge him (Dr. England) unjustly, I shall recur to the assertion which I heard him make respecting the doctrine of transubstantiation; and the substance of his declaration was that this doctrine had never been questioned from the time of the Apostles up to the tenth century. It was essential to his argument to show the absence of controversy, inasmuch as nothing less than universal consent can prove a Catholic doctrine. Now, I can prove from authorities taken from the first and best ages of the church—1. That this doctrine was not then believed; and 2. It can be shown that it was questioned long before the tenth age."

To support his two propositions he gives a passage from Tertullian, one from Justin Martyr, a reference to Origen, a passage from Eusebius, one from St. Gregory Nazianzen, one from St. John Chrysostom, and two from St. Augustine. We do not now mean to enter upon the controversy, but we assert the fact, that every one of the above writers believed and taught our doctrine, and did not deny the tenet of transubstantiation. Of course our assertion is no proof. But we think it necessary to state the fact, though we should not now think it conducive to any good purpose to enter upon a theological controversy upon the subject. The doctrine is fairly ours. Ratio and we differ as to the fact, whether it was the doctrine of the above-named writers. We say it was, he says it was not, and he produces the passages to support his assertion. We leave him in possession of the field, not because we doubt the sufficiency of our proofs, but because we do not think it would be now useful to enter upon the contest. And we will even go farther. Let him fairly state our doctrine upon any point, and we shall remain quiet. Our object is not to enter the field of polemics, but to prevent our being misrepresented. We differ with him also as to his statement that this doctrine was not an article of faith until the time of the Lateran

Council under Innocent III., and also as to his statement regarding Durandus.

We shall not now undertake to answer the following argument against this doctrine, which has been a thousand times answered, though perhaps not yet in the State of Georgia.

"A doctrine so at variance with the senses could not be proved by a miracle, because the senses must necessarily preside as judges, both in the case of the doctrine, and in the case of the miracle, and if these judges are obliged to abjure the exercise of their proper discernment in the case of the doctrine, they may be required to make a similar abjuration in the case of the miracle, and thus the absurdity of the doctrine, would annul the validity of the miracle."

The reasoning, to be sure, has only two faults, the first begging the question by assuming the doctrine to be absurd, and the second assuming that possibility which will never become a fact, will become fact, and then arguing upon that fact as if it existed. But is not this the principle upon which the Unitarian will not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ? His senses tell him that this is only a man; no miracle could prove him to be a god, because if he uses his senses to examine the miracle, why shall he be forbidden to use them in examining the person. His senses tell him only of a human being, "the absurdity of the doctrine would annul the validity of the miracle." So respecting the Trinity; no miracle could prove it, because "the absurdity of the doctrine would annul the validity of the miracle." M. Voltaire, Mr. Hume, Collins, Tindal, and many others used it to prove that there could be no revelation, and even to prove that there could be no miracle. We are sorry to see Ratio in such company, but he has chosen for himself.

Suppose the possibility of a miracle. The senses take cognizance of the fact, the judgment decides; God has here manifested his commission. The commissioner says, "God can place one substance under the appearance of another, and not leave it in your power by your senses to detect the change. He has frequently done so, he has given to angelic substance human appearance. Thus he has placed one substance under a different appearance from what it naturally has, and no exertion of your senses could detect the change. He can, then, by his power change the substance without altering the appearance; you have seen by the miracle the validity of my commission; I am commissioned to inform you that when a particular act shall be done by this individual over that bread, God will by his power change its substance, and though the substance shall be changed, the appearance shall continue unchanged. And no examination of your senses shall be able to detect the change: but you will believe the fact because God has told you through me, and his word is at least as good evidence as your senses." All this may

be absurd. But we do not think it is. We believe the senses are made judges of the first miracle, but never can be called upon to examine for evidence of a change which God says will take place, without their having the power to detect it.

Indeed we think it would be very useless labour to try and discover by the senses what God says shall not come under the cognizance of sense, and is only to be received by faith. And it is equally useless to moot the point with a writer who avows that, "it is idle to harass antiquity about a matter which a hundred miracles could not demonstrate." Why then should we waste our time and load our columns in harassing antiquity?

There is one other topic upon which we did mean to touch. But we are requested not to do so, and that request is enough. We did mean to remark upon the ungentlemanly abuse and insulting falsehoods, respecting Dr. England, which are to be found in more abundance in the communications of Mr. Ratio. The Bishop may "cast forth upon his hearers the muddy jargon of Jesuitical logic," he may "waste much pains in attempting to wash an Ethiopian white, and lose his labour and his soap," he may "have no learning," he may make the "idle parade of much logic to prove a small design," he may exhibit "the perplexing intricacies of extemporaneous repetition," but we are not aware of the time or the place that "he has denied historical facts," nor are we aware of the appropriateness of the following passage.

"The right reverend gentleman whom I have already named, has made such bold and insolent demands upon our credulity in behalf of his church, that it would be treason against the truth to allow such pretensions to pass without a merited rebuke. Had he confined his efforts to the correction of abuses in his own church, and exerted his gifts in the discussion and recommendation of Christian principles and Christian morality, I should not have considered it my business to notice his views, or his preaching. But since he has come out in the most humbling representations of the Protestant part of our Christian communities, treating us without distinction as the merest dolts in knowledge, it seemed certainly time to remind him, that whatever might be our ignorance on matters of polemical divinity among Roman Catholics, there is no great reason to apprehend that wisdom will die with him."

If Dr. England has made those humbling representations of the Protestant part of our Christian communities, treating them without distinction as the merest dolts in knowledge, it is more than we are aware of. The only statement which he authorizes us to make is, that he has never done so; and he challenges those who make the accusation to say when and where and what.

There are two remarks which we will add. Without denying that the Bishop has had some share in the exposure of the falsehoods of the

Missionary, the editor of that paper is under many obligations to several others of his friends, and to some not residing in South Carolina. And we assure Mr. Ratio, that amongst the Protestant part of our Christian communities, we have many very highly respectable friends, whom so far from considering dolts in knowledge, we esteem for many fine qualities of their hearts, and for their deep erudition and varied stock of literature. And if the good gentlemen of Mount Zion were ignorant of polemical divinity among Roman Catholics, they ought not to have so unnecessarily interfered with the tenets of which they were ignorant, and heaped such uncalled for obloquy upon the members of a church, who did not interfere in their concerns, and who are now as ready to permit the troubled waters to subside, as they are to use that liberty which the constitution affords of contradicting their calumniators. We repeat, there can be no use, that we can discover, in continuing the attacks and the explanations. We have not commenced, we have declined polemic discussions. We have not singled out an individual for our personal attacks. We now lay our pen aside unless we shall be compelled to resume it.

Since writing the above, we have received the *Missionary* of October 18, which contains the following passage:

"The *Miscellany* has given several specimens of the Roman Catholic translation of the Scriptures to show how mightily deceived we all are who depend upon the versions in common use. The comparative merits of these translations we shall not attempt to examine, but shall simply add a specimen or two, that our readers may see how artfully they make them speak the language of their '*Missals* and *Breviaries.*' To countenance beatifying or making saints, they translate *James* v. 11, not as it ought to be: 'Behold how we account those blessed;' but, 'Behold how we beatify those who have suffered with constancy.' To favour their processions, instead of reading, (*Heb.* xi. 30,) 'The walls of Jericho fell down after they compassed it about seven days;' they read, 'After a procession of seven days around it.' And to give a better colour to their pilgrimages, Paul, according to their version, requires it as the qualification 'of a good widow,' 'that she had lodged Pilgrims.' (1 *Tim.* 10.) And John praises 'Gaius' for having 'dealt faithfully with pilgrims.' What the Protestant version renders 'repentance,' the Catholic version renders 'penance,' and hundreds of other places could be selected where the object of the translators is equally obvious."

We would take it as a favour if the editor of the *Missionary* would add to the justice which he has latterly done to us by inserting the following correction:

Catholic Version, James, v. 11. "Behold we account them blessed who have suffered," and so forth.

Given by the *Missionary* as *Catholic,* v. 11. "Behold how we beatify those who have suffered with constancy."

Protestant Version, v. 11. "Behold we count them happy which endure," and so forth.

Catholic, I *Tim.* v. 10. "If she have exercised hospitality, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have ministered to them that suffer tribulation," and so forth.

Imputed, v. 10. "That she have lodged pilgrims."

Protestant, v. 10. "If she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted," and so forth.

Catholic, III *John*, v. "Dearly beloved, thou dost faithfully whatsoever thou dost for the brethren and that for strangers."

Imputed, "Having dealt faithfully with pilgrims."

Protestant, 5. "Beloved, thou dost faithfully whatsoever thou doest to the brethren, and to strangers."

Catholic, Hebrews xi. 30. "By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, by the going round them seven days."

Imputed, 30. "After a procession of seven days round it."

Protestant, 30. "By faith the walls of Jericho fell down after they were compassed about seven days."

The Catholic version is that published first by the English College in Rheims, 1582, which is the standard English version of the church. The Protestant version which we use, is the English standard version of King James, printed by the privileged Oxford press, and distributed by the British Association. Now if there be question of the fact as to what is meant by compassing in that version, we state that it means going round, so that both versions do really agree. To prove that compassing Jericho means going round Jericho, we refer to the description of the fact referred to. We copy the Protestant version:

Joshua, vi. 3. "And ye shall compass the city, all ye men of war, and go round about the city once. Thus shalt thou do six days.

"4. And the seven priests shall bear before the ark seven trumpets of rams' horns: and the seventh day ye shall compass the city seven times, and the priests shall blow with the trumpets."

"7. And he said to the people, Pass on, and compass the city, and let him that is armed pass on before the ark of the Lord."

"11. So the ark of the Lord compassed the city, going about it."

Thus, in fact, in those passages, there is no difference whatsoever between the Catholic version and the Protestant version.

With respect to our idolatry, it is now acknowledged that we do not look upon images to be God. The whole difficulty is reduced to the meaning of the word worship. In a sense in which that word is used by the *Missionary*, we do not worship anything but God. We shall procure for him the statute of the State of North Carolina, and our worship is expressed by its enactment. Roman Catholics are neither required nor permitted by the church to worship images.

"In taking our leave of the editor of the *Miscellany*, we can assure him that we harbour not the least animosity towards him or any other member of the Roman

Catholic communion. That we may be deceived on some of those points on which we have been at issue, is possible. But it has been, and is still, the uniform conviction of our minds, that there are many and radical errors both in the faith and in the practice of the Roman Catholic Church."

Such is his farewell: we reciprocate it, and have only to request that when he attacks, what he is pleased to call our "errors," he will quote our Councils or our Catechisms, and not make for us tenets which neither we nor our fathers ever held.

SECTION XIX.

WHICH IS IT? MISTAKES OR WORSE.

Our old friend, the *Missionary*, treats us occasionally with some of his shots, though he retreated gladly in the smoke, as he called it, of our fire upon the *North American Review*. Whether it was exactly one hundred, or one hundred and one falsehoods of his that we exposed, we cannot now say. One should think he should at least have kept a solemn promise deliberately made; not to notice us, or any person connected with our paper, unless greatly provoked. Our readers can testify that we gave him no provocation. Yet he has more than once broken his promise.

The following delectable *morceau* appears in the publication of Mount Zion, on Monday, March 14:—

"*The Hebrews.*—We learn, from Annapolis, that on Friday the bill for the relief of the Hebrews, in Maryland, came up in the House of Delegates, and, on the votes being taken, they stood 30 affirmative and 30 negative.—Several members were sick who would have voted for the bill. The Senate, on the same evening, passed the bill, and on Saturday it was again to come before the House of Delegates."—*Nat. Intelligencer.*

Upon which the *Missionary* furnishes the following comment:—

"It is known that the Jews in Maryland have not enjoyed the franchises of citizens. An attempt was made two or three years ago, if our recollection serves us, to alter the constitution of that state, so as to remove this odious restriction, but without success. A similar attempt is made again, as will appear from the following extract, with what success we cannot predict. This is Catholic Maryland—free Catholic Maryland of which Bishop England boasts so much;—the only state in the Union where a religious test law is in force."

Now for the facts:—Catholic Maryland established equal rights for all Christians upon its settlement; the Hebrews were not known in the country, and were not adverted to, we should suppose, merely upon that ground. Puritan New England persecuted Episcopalians. Episcopalian Virginia persecuted Puritans. Both persecuted Catholics. The Catholics of Maryland received the refugees from each; gave them equal

rights with Catholics. The refugee Puritans and Episcopalians were elected into the legislative councils of Maryland; they formed a majority, we will not now say in what manner: *they excluded the Catholics*; *they subjected them to the penal laws.* The Catholics not only were stripped of their power, but also of their property by the men, and the descendants of the men, whom they saved from murdering each other under the pretext of religion. Maryland became the stronghold of Protestantism. It is at present more Protestant than Catholic. At the revolution it was much more so than it is now. The present Constitution of Maryland was framed at the time that the state was Protestant, or nearly Protestant. Some of the old Catholic settlers had preserved some of their property, others had taken refuge in Pennsylvania, in which the Quakers permitted them to live unmolested. Be the present Constitution good or otherwise, it is not the work of Catholics. Maryland frequently has had legislatures since the revolution without two Catholics in its houses; we doubt if the number of Catholic members ever amounted in any session to eight. The legislature of Maryland has been and is Protestant.

We do join Bishop England in boasting that Catholic Maryland exhibited the spirit of our religion in its first Constitution. The *Missionary* may, if he will, boast of the spirit of his religion as exhibited in that state. Will he have the honesty to correct his calumny?

Does he forget New Jersey, with its Protestant restrictions?

Does he forget North Carolina, with its Protestant restrictions?

We advise him to rest content with the exposure which he has already had.

PART III.

HISTORY.

HISTORY

ON THE RESIDENCE OF ST. PETER IN ROME.[1]

By the Rev. A. Blanc, one of the Pastors of Mens, Isere

[The occasion which gave rise to the following series of letters concerning a point of historical controversy, now ceded by most intelligent Anti-Catholic writers, is fully explained in the brief correspondence which is prefixed, extracted from the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, for November 8, 1828. The Letters appeared in this and several subsequent numbers of the *Miscellany*, and were republished in a pamphlet form. The originals of passages quoted have not been given, as most of them are merely historical, and can scarcely admit of question.]

THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

There is a Magazine, bearing this title, published in Philadelphia, every month, and devoted to the cause of Presbyterianism. In the number for last July, an article appeared, which we were informed assailed us most heroically, and charged us with deceit and falsehood; we were somewhat anxious to see the production, and requested a friend to endeavour to procure a copy: he informed us that a gentleman who was a subscriber, and had the *Advocate*, declined lending it to us, upon the ground that it was better we should not see it, lest it should hurt our feelings. We thought the reason anything but reasonable, coming from the quarter whence it emanated. Our friend continued his efforts, and in another way was more successful. Nearly a month since, the Bishop sent to our office, accompanying the *Christian Advocate* for July, the following note, which he received together with it, stating that all he required was, through a motive of delicacy, the suppression of the names it contained; with which requisition we comply. The note will explain itself.[2]

"WENTWORTH STREET, Oct. 5, 1828.

"*To the Right Rev. Bishop England.*

"*Right Reverend and Dear Sir*:—Some time since I promised our mutual friend Dr. . . . , to procure for him the *Christian Spectator*, it being a work, as we supposed, that contained a most foul calumny against yourself and the respectable body

[1] The purpose of Protestants in denying that St. Peter lived and died at Rome is to break up the line of Apostolic succession. If St. Peter did not die as Bishop of Rome, then it follows that the Pope, the present Bishop of Rome, is not the successor of St. Peter. In a lengthy treatise on this question, the learned Protestant Bishop Ellicott says: "Nothing but Protestant prejudices can stand against the historical evidence that St. Peter sojourned and died at Rome. Whatever theological consequences may follow from it, it is as certain that St. Peter was at Rome as that St. John was at Ephesus."—ED.

[2] From the *United States Catholic Miscellany* of Nov. 8, 1828.

of clergy over whom you preside. On continuing my exertions, I have ascertained that it is the *Christian Advocate,* not the other work mentioned. Being unacquainted with his place of residence, and considering that it was intended to meet your eye, I have taken the liberty of sending it to you for perusal. The highly offensive manner is contained in page 298, second column. A Protestant myself, and deeply attached to my religion, I cannot but greatly regret, and severely condemn, the use of such means. May the time soon arrive when bigotry shall be consigned to its native nothingness, and no other arms be used than those of attraction, mildness, and persuasive argument. In this prayer the liberal of both religions will most cordially unite.

"Yours, very respectfully, ..."

We transmitted the article to our friend B. C., with a request that he would favour us with a few letters on it as soon as convenient; and we are happy to lay his first upon the subject before our readers this day.

The charge made against us is in the following words:—

"I have access to a weekly paper published in Charleston, called the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* which affords melancholy proof of their (the Catholic Priests) industry, success, and deep delusion—as well as their hatred of Protestant teachers, and of the unblushing falsehoods they invent and propagate, to rivet the fetters of their followers, and decoy the ignorant into their toils."

When a man professing to be a teacher of truth comes forward publicly to make such a charge as the above, he owes it to himself to be fully prepared to support his allegations; and we trust the American public will not admit the assertion of this man without sufficient proof. He states that he has access to the *Miscellany*; if he had not, we would furnish him with any numbers that may be at our disposal, and which he might need to sustain his charge, or transmit to him the copy of any article he may please to designate: and as we now deny the truth of his accusation, and appeal to the public, he must feel himself no longer at liberty to decline his prosecution. For the present, we conclude with the following document:—

"Charleston, S. C., Nov. 5th, 1828.

"*To. Mr. A. Finley,* Philadelphia.

"*Sir*:—I beg leave to draw your attention to a paragraph published by you in the 67th No. of the *Christian Advocate,* for July, 1828, page 298, column 2, regarding the *United States Catholic Miscellany* and the Catholic priests. I beg also to inform you that I am the publisher of the *Miscellany,* and have the honour of being a priest of the Catholic Church; and I call upon you, as you value your reputation as an honest man, for the authority upon which you published and circulated that paragraph, which I pronounce to be an unprovoked and wanton libel upon myself, my publication, and the religion and order to which I have the honour of belonging.

"Your obedient servant,

"J. F. O'Neill."

"Philadelphia, Nov. 14, 1828.

"*Rev. J. F. O'Neill*:

"*Sir*:—I have just received your communication of the 5th inst., relative to a paragraph in the *Christian Advocate* of July last. Permit me to observe that I am only the publisher (and that but ostensibly) of that work, and have nothing whatever to do with, or any influence over, the matter which composes it.

"Your letter will be handed, without delay, to the . . . . ., the editor and proprietor, who will act in reference to it as he may think proper.

"I am respectfully,

"Your obedient servant,

"ANTHONY FINLEY."

The Reverend Doctor, whose name was given, has not, as far as the publisher of these letters can learn, made any reparation.

ON THE RESIDENCE OF ST. PETER AT ROME.[3]

It is upon the testimony of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, that the Popish tradition rests, respecting St. Peter's being at Rome, his founding a church there, and for twenty-five years discharging in it the functions of a bishop. Papias was copied by Clement of Alexandria; Clement was copied by Eusebius,[4] and the latter has been copied by many authors, ancient and modern, who have been, perhaps, too much interested to render credible a fact, which will always be of very little importance to those who build their faith, not on the person of St. Peter, but upon the corner stone, Jesus Christ. The account of Papias, which is based upon a hearsay only, about eighty years after the occurrence to which it refers, is still extant, and is full of fables and ridiculous tales,—such as the contest which this Apostle sustained against Simon the sorcerer, his crucifixion with his head downwards—as if Nero had left to the Christians the care of settling the forms of their own punishment—and other similar things, which were reported originally only by this Papias himself. Eusebius, speaking of him, calls him "a man of narrow genius, and too credulous."

According to the testimony of the same Eusebius,[5] Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, an author of the second century, affirms also that St. Peter and St. Paul met at Corinth, and that they departed together for Rome, where they suffered martyrdom. But, besides that Dionysius himself complains that his letters had been falsified by heretics,[6] a circumstance which considerably invalidates the authority of his writings, this testimony ought not to outweigh the truth of our Holy Scriptures, which, with the divine assistance, we shall bring forward below. Let us also make, in passing, the remark, that when the fathers are produced against us in order to support dogmas or facts, which our opponent feels

[3] From the *Philadelphia Christian Advocate* translated from the *Archives du Christianisme* by the Rev. A. Blanc, one of the Pastors of Mens, Isere.

[4] Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib ii. c. 14, 15, *et seq.*

[5] *Ibid.* lib. ii. 25.

[6] *Ibid.* lib. iv. 23.

himself interested in maintaining, we ought to be the more upon our guard, because the Council of Trent has decided that the books of the ancient fathers ought to be *purged* (*expurgati*); a circumstance that, consequently, should make us very circumspect in the admission of passages which they cite against us; while, on the other hand, the passages of these fathers which we allege, remain in all their force, since we possess the books of the ancients only from the hands of our adversaries.

The tradition of this journey of St. Peter to Rome rests, moreover, upon the supposition that the Babylon from which he wrote his first epistle, was Rome. Eusebius strengthens this conjecture, by saying that Peter "figuratively called Rome Babylon."[7] But many learned men with reason maintain that the name, Babylon, ought to be taken in its proper signification, for Babylon of Chaldea, or that of Egypt, which is now Grand Cairo, where were many Jews, to whom Peter was specially sent, as St. Paul teaches us, in the second chapter of his *Epistle to the Galatians.*

To all these pretensions, we can oppose, in the first place, the testimony of Clement, who is reckoned to have been the third or fourth Bishop of Rome. This pious and holy person, in his admirable epistle to the Corinthians, expresses himself thus, on the subject of St. Peter and St. Paul: "Through unjust envy, Peter did not endure one or two, but a very great number of trials; and at last, having suffered martyrdom, he went to his place in glory. Through the same envy, Paul received the reward of his patience, having been in prison or chains seven times, beaten twice, stoned once; and after he had been the herald of the Word of God in the East and in the West, he obtained by faith an illustrious victory. Having reached the extremity of the West, he suffered martyrdom under the emperors. Thus he departed from this world, and went to a holy place, leaving us a singular example of patience." What is the likelihood, that, in the parallel which Clement draws between these two Apostles, he should forget to say that, under the emperors, he suffered the pains of martyrdom? Would he have neglected a fact, in this manner, which would have given additional weight to his epistle, and done honour to his see? But let us come to the testimony of our Holy Scriptures.

The best Catholic ecclesiastical writers put the martyrdom of St. Stephen in the seventh year after the death of Jesus Christ; in other words, A. D. 40. The conversion of St. Paul, at soonest, happened this year. Thus we see seven years already past. At this epoch, St. Peter

[7] Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 15.

was still at Jerusalem with the other apostles; and not until some time afterwards, he was sent with St. John to strengthen the Samaritans, who had been converted by the ministry of St. Philip. "Now, when the Apostles who were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John." (*Acts* viii. 14). At this epoch, Peter was still under the authority of the apostolical college; it was only five or six hundred years afterwards that he seized upon the sovereign power, in the person of his successors. After the conversion of St. Paul, we find St. Peter at Lydda, where he cured Eneas (*Acts* ix. 32-34); at Joppa, where he raised Dorcas from the dead (ix. 36-41); at Cesarea, where he converted Cornelius, (x). Upon the report spreading that Peter had eaten with the Gentiles, he returns to Jerusalem, and vindicates himself before "them that were of the circumcision," (xi). This journey of Peter, his preaching in the provinces of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, his abode at Joppa, and the other events which St. Luke relates, occupy a space of three years, (A. D. 43.) We learn that the Christians, dispersed on the occasion of the death of Stephen, had carried the good savour of the Gospel to Antioch. Thither Barnabas was immediately sent, who "seeing the grace of God, departed to Tarsus to seek Paul" (*Acts* xi. 25), and bring him to Antioch, where they remained "a whole year," (xi. 26—A. D. 44.) About this time the famine predicted by Agabus, should be placed, the martyrdom of St. James, the imprisonment of St. Peter, and his remarkable deliverance, (*Acts* xii.) Thus far St. Peter is constantly found in Judea, not manifesting upon any occasion the desire of going to Rome: and why should he have gone thither, since that city fell not within his charge? St. Paul says positively, "The gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; for he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me towards the Gentiles—James, Cephas, and John, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go into the heathen, and they unto the circumcision," (*Gal.* ii. 7-9). St. Paul, three years after his conversion, going up to Jerusalem to carry the alms of the Christians of Antioch and the circumjacent places, met Peter there, with whom he remained fifteen days, (*Acts* xi. 30; *Gal.* i. 18). He went up thither a second time, fourteen years afterwards (*Gal.* ii. 1), and there he still met with Peter and his principal colleagues, (v. 9—A. D. 58). Behold, then, Peter constantly at Jerusalem, seven years—ten years—twenty-five years, after the death of Jesus Christ. If we read with a little attention the eleventh verse of this second chapter of the *Epistle to the Galatians*, it appears that it was not till after this time

that St. Peter went to Antioch, where, it is pretended, this Apostle occupied the Episcopal chair for seven years; which would be still so many to be deducted from his pretended residence at Rome.

But this is not all. St. Paul wrote to the Romans in the year 57 or 58, about 25 years after the death of Christ; at this very time, St. Peter ought to have been at Rome, or never. Meanwhile St. Paul glories in being especially their Apostle: "I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify my office." If St. Peter had been settled and acknowledged as their proper apostle or bishop for several years past, would it not have been great arrogance in Paul to deprive him, after some sort, of his title and character? Above all, would it not have been great injustice to say, "From Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." (*Rom.* xv. 19, 20). How then should he think of going to Rome, if St. Peter had already built there the first church of the world? Why, in the long detail of salutations, which fill almost the whole of the last chapter of this epistle, is there no mention made of the great head of the universal Church? In A. D. 60, when Paul arrived at Rome, he called together the principal Jews that were in the city, (*Acts* xxviii 17), without supposing himself to usurp the rights and the authority of the prince of the Apostles, without even thinking of St. Peter, who beyond controversy would have been of the greatest utility to him in his bonds. (A. D. 62). St. Paul remained two whole years in Rome (*Acts* xxviii. 30); he wrote from thence divers letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and the Philippians; all these letters close with the salutations of the principal Christians of that famous city, and nowhere do we find a single word of St. Peter. How shall this silence be accounted for [consistently with Peter's supposed presence at Rome?] Truly, I should be curious to know. "Aristarchus," (it is said in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, iv. 10, 11,) "my fellow-prisoner—and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas—and Jesus who is called Justus, who are of the circumcision: these only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, who have been a comfort to me." Mark well the words "these only." How injurious to St. Peter, if he had been at Rome!

Upon his return to Rome, A. D. 63, St. Paul came with Timothy into the Isle of Crete or Candia, where he preached the Gospel. But not being able to remain there, he left Titus with the necessary instructions to regulate all things according to the Lord, (*Tit.* i. 5). He was at Colosse, where Philemon lived (*Phil.* 22); at Ephesus, where he left Tim-

othy (*Tim.* i. 3); and at Philippi, where he wrote the First Epistle to Timothy, about A. D. 64. Finally, after having passed through Nicopolis (*Tit.* iii. 12), and Troas (*II Tim.* iv. 13), he returned to Corinth (*II Tim.* iv. 20), and arrived, for the second time, at Rome, A. D. 65 or 66, and the 10th or 11th of the reign of Nero. He was then put in so close a prison that Onesiphorus could scarcely find him, (*II Tim.* i. 17), and the persecution was so great, that he wrote to his dearly beloved pupil, Timothy, (*II Tim.* iv. 16), that "no man stood with him, but all men forsook him." Would not this have been a fine eulogy on St. Peter, if he had been at Rome? Let us farther observe, that this Apostle, to whom was committed the circumcision, as we have remarked above, never wrote an epistle to the Romans; that he never speaks of them in the two letters, which we have from him; and that, in writing the second to the same churches to which he had written the first, (*II Pet.* iii. 1) he speaks to them as aware that he would shortly quit this earthly tabernacle (*II Pet.* i. 14). Let us finally remark, that St. Peter, although near his departure from this world, salutes the faithful only on the part of Marcus his son (I Pet. v. 14), without speaking of St. Paul, whose companion in martyrdom some would have him to be.

To conclude, whether St. Peter resided at Rome or not, is of no consequence to our faith: but it is wholly otherwise with them who have built so prodigious an edifice upon a foundation so uncertain. Let us say with this holy Apostle, to the only Saviour of souls, "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." (*John* vi. 68, 69). And if, like him, we have denied this adorable Master, like him let us weep bitterly, and mercy shall be granted us.

LETTER I.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 4, 1828.

My Friends:—I take the liberty of addressing to you, a few letters upon a subject which, to some of you, is interesting, but which others regard as of little or no moment. No person is forced to read what I write; and, therefore, no person can complain of my treating this matter, provided, in so doing, I shall not infringe upon their feelings.

There is a monthly Magazine, called *The Christian Advocate*, published in Philadelphia, by A. Finley: in the 67th No. of which, for July 1828, is found the following preface to a dissertation.

"We are indebted to a clerical brother, to whom we lent a few numbers of the *Archives du Christianisme*, for the following translation. It will convey useful

information to many of our readers—and we earnestly recommend to the serious consideration of all, the remarks of the translator at the close. While the Romanists are pursuing an organized system to diffuse their pernicious errors in our country, it does seem to us that some systematic endeavours should be employed to counteract them.''

This dissertation and its appendages are published to the American people as a deliberate attack upon what the writer is pleased to call the Romanists, that is the Roman Catholics, to whose body I have the honour and happiness of belonging. I am not aware of any organized system amongst us, save that which is common to all our brethren of other denominations: the system of having our public churches and our regular ministry. If a line of distinction were to be drawn between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches of the United States, upon the point of ''organized system,'' I am of opinion that, owing to circumstances which I am in charity bound to suppose beyond the control of those with whom the remedy lies, the former is manifestly the worst organized church in our states;[8] and it is notoriously defective in the essential points of system, which are community of counsel, and unity of action. If irony and sarcasm were intended by the writer, I lament that he has had the cause afforded for his display: yet still he might have pitied our weakness, and if our failure was desirable, he might have continued satisfied that until we shall be able, not to mend our system but to supply its want, and to organize our provincial church, we must be exposed to mortification and disappointment. He should not then have made what does not exist, a pretext for his rude assault; and despicable as our weakness may be, it cannot be admitted to excuse his want of urbanity.

This writer complains of the attempt to diffuse our pernicious errors. Can he be a Protestant who writes thus? The first principle of a Protestant is, that the Bible, as understood by those who earnestly seek after truth, will lead to the knowledge of God, and not to pernicious error: now we discover our doctrines in this sacred book as understood by us after earnest search: it is true our tenets do not agree with the opinions of the writer in the Advocate, but surely he claims no infallibility for himself nor for his church: how dares he, then, call those tenets drawn by us from the word of God, pernicious errors, when it is, according to his own principle, equally a chance that he is in error, and that we follow the truth?

I cannot avoid here noticing another exhibition of his intention to

[8] This was written A. D. 1829, since when the principal defects lamented by the writer have been supplied: this language therefore cannot correctly be applied to the Catholic Church of the U. S. as it now exists.

undervalue us; but it is not peculiar to him, it is pretty general. Writing in his own name, or in that of the denomination to which he belongs, he calls America our country. Really, my friends, I always looked upon America to be as much the country of old Charles Carroll of Carrollton as of any Presbyterian gentleman or of any clerical brother who writes for the *Christian Advocate*, although I have frequently known the vainglorious boasting of men, who in the same breath proclaimed our Union "a Protestant country," and bewailing that the people here sat in darkness and in the shadow of death, complained that they were Sabbath-breakers, even to the travelling in stages and steamboats, yea, so far as to permit small meats to be sold in open market, in southern cities, on the summer Sabbath morning!!!

However, it seems that full scope was not afforded for the zeal of the writer in the wrestling with those abominations, but that he had a superabundance which could only be expended upon the Romanists; neither was he content that the venerable Bishop White and his brother Bowen, together with their two armies of zealous ladies, should have the exclusive honour of pelting Popish pastors with their paper pellets, for their enormous errors, but that this chosen one should like another Saul lead his host to complete the victory by pursuing the Philistines, whom Jonathan and his armour-bearer had already routed.

It cannot be unknown to you that "systematic endeavours" have been during a long period "employed to counteract the Romanists" in all parts of this Union, from the period when the ebullitions of zeal against Popery in New Zealand and in Georgia rendered abortive the mission of Franklin, of Carroll, and of Chase into Canada, down to the present day; you that have ears to hear must frequently have found the religion of your Catholic progenitors "systematically" denounced in prayer, and in declamation from the desk, the pulpit, and the stump; in the tale of your horrified grandam and of your enthusiastic attendant in the nursery; in conning over the spelling and the reading book of your infancy, in the nasal eloquence of your pedantic pedagogue, in the learned lucubrations of your proud professor, as well as in the pretty lispings of your sweet Sunday school spinsters. Yea, this is but a faint outline of the "systematic endeavours," which are so powerfully aided by the upturned eye, the sigh of pity, the ejaculation of pious wonder, and the sanctimonious sneer. If missions hither and thither, if the donations and legacies of the wealthy, if the gathering of the mites of the poor, the calculation of the back stitches and the hemmings and fellings of the industrious, the prayers of those who are "powerful to wrestle with the Lord," the publication of the conversions of blank papists in

blank ——— places to the amount of ——— numbers, testified by blank witnesses to blank ——— persons of blank ——— respectability: if the distribution of tracts filled with misrepresentations of the Roman Catholic religion and practices, and a thousand other such modes of "systematic endeavours," be not already in existence, the people of America are indeed deluded. What farther "systematic endeavours should be employed to counteract the Romanists," the holy editor saith not: and we cannot determine unless he would induce all the states to imitate North Carolina and New Jersey in their degrading bigotry; for you are of course aware, my friends, that neither of those two sanctified states will admit a Papist to hold any civil office.

The editor then gives the translation of an article from a French publication, *Archives du Christianisme*, "On the residence of St. Peter at Rome," which dissertation I intend to examine in these letters; and then subjoins:

"*Note by the Translator.*—It will appear from M. Blanc's scriptural statement of the question respecting Peter's residence at Rome, that it is very doubtful whether that Apostle ever saw Rome, and demonstrably evident, that he never was bishop of that city. This removes the very corner stone on which Roman Catholicism rests. For if Peter was not Bishop of Rome, the bishops or popes of Rome are not his successors; and even the most devoted Catholic must then see, that the assumed authority of the Pope is unhallowed and unchristian usurpation, the traditions of the Romish Church a tissue of human inventions, and the infallibility of that church a dream. At a time when the emissaries of that delusion are compassing sea and land to gain proselytes, especially in the south and west of our land, it is believed that the above brief exposure of the false foundation on which they build their Babel, may not be unprofitable. In France, it has been republished and circulated in the form of a tract; and it might be attended with benefit to souls, if several thousand copies of it were dispersed in those portions of our own country which are most exposed to the influence and the arts of men, who would have the whole world to wonder after, and worship "the beast."

"The translator, in a letter to the editor, which accompanied the above, very justly adds—

" 'It seems to me that Protestants should not be idle spectators of the exertions of the Catholic priests to waylay the unwary, and destroy the simple. I have access to a weekly paper published in Charleston, called the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, which affords melancholy proof of their industry, success, and deep delusion—as well as of their hatred of Protestant teachers, and of the unblushing falsehoods they invent and propagate to rivet the fetters of their followers, and decoy the ignorant into their toils.' "

Allow me, my friends, to address you freely. You who differ from me in religious sentiment are too frequently under the impression that we are continually in the habit of using insulting and opprobrious language to you and of you, and that you and your ministers always speak of us in kind, mild, charitable, affectionate and conciliating terms. I

would take the liberty of requesting you who agree in tenets with the *Christian Advocate*, to observe for a few Sabbaths the mode in which Roman Catholics are mentioned or alluded to, by your ministers in their prayers and preachings; and if you have ever heard a Roman Catholic priest, ask your own conscience whether in his service you found him style you or your congregation beasts: whether you heard him using the phrases which are here used regarding our clergy; seeking unhallowed and unchristian usurpation, emissaries of delusion, and our church a Babel!!! Do not then, I pray you, be over hasty in condemning us of want of charity, and boasting of your superior liberality.

I put it to you, my friends, whether a more insulting and ungenerous passage could be produced than that here used against the "Catholic priests," viz.: that they "waylay the unwary and destroy the simple!" It is not surpassed by the description which follows of the mode, "hatred of Protestant teachers, deep delusion, unblushing falsehoods invented by them, and propagated by them to rivet the fetters of their followers, and decoy the ignorant into their toils." And where is the proof of this terrible charge to be found?—Upon the pages of the *United States Catholic Miscellany*. You are in the habit of reading those pages, and I ask you whether they inculcate that hatred, whether they exhibit that falsehood? To the editors themselves I leave their own vindication. But I unequivocally assert that a more insolent spirit of bigotry was never breathed than in this wretched expression, a more unfounded charge has never been made than in this offensive paragraph. And yet, my friends, those men boast of their superior charity, and of their superior meekness!!! In the name of insulted truth, let them vindicate themselves if they can: let them produce from the pages of the *Miscellany* even one passage which exhibits a tithe of the hatred to Presbyterian or to any other Protestant teachers which is here expressed by this holy man, this "clerical brother," against "Catholic priests;" and if they cannot, what ought to be thought of this *Christian Advocate*?

The great object, however, is to induce "Protestants not to be idle spectators of the exertions of the Catholic priests." Now this forcibly reminds me of a scene which I once witnessed in a court-house. The judges were much annoyed by the loud, though indistinct muttering of some fellow, and one of them called to the sheriff to seize upon the delinquent and thrust him into the dock: upon which the tone was changed, and his honour very audibly addressed: "I defy you and the sheriff, for I am already in the dock," and the cachinnations of the crowd (to use a big but expressive word) amused the distruber, whilst they irritated the bench. So it is with our priests; they are already in the dock,

and the advocate of our castigation knows, that from Maine to Florida, and from the Atlantic to the Stony Mountains, some thousands of roarers and some hundreds of presses assail us, and oppose the "exertions of the Catholic priests," whilst collectors of rags and of corn, and of cents and of dollars, incessantly beg for provender and raiment, not only to feed the enthusiastic host of the heavenly assailants, but also to train up others, so that they may enter, ready drilled, and fully armed, to occupy the places of the veterans who might fall asleep in the Lord. Neither is the arm of the flesh always restrained, nor doth the sword of Gideon always rust in its scabbard: for beside that the fat of the land is openly reserved for the chosen ones of Israel in North Carolina and New Jersey, I could recount the acts of stout warriors who can smite powerfully in secret, and destroy the unholy under the guise of liberality. The Christian Advocate might then rest fully satisfied that the sons of Protestant Israel neither sleep nor slumber; and though he might himself abominate works of supererogation in theory, he hath in this instance been heterodox in practice; for of a truth, it is a work of supererogation to call upon Protestants, as he hath done, to oppose the priests.

He has given to us his essay, and I shall give to you its examination; you will decide according to the evidence.

Yours, respectfully, B. C.

LETTER II.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 11, 1828.

My Friends:—I have requested the editors of the *Miscellany* to insert the article which I examine. The translator expresses his opinion that it might be attended with benefit to souls if several thousand copies of it were dispersed in those portions of our own country which are most exposed to the influence and the arts of men, who would have the whole world to wonder after, and worship "the beast." Of course his object is to have the distribution made amongst the Roman Catholics and those exposed to their arts and delusions, and, as the most dangerous of those delusions are the unblushing falsehoods of the *Miscellany*, the pious translator must feel gratified at having his desires effectually accomplished by our circulation of his tract amongst the thousands who read this publication.

The question which the dissertation undertakes to dispose of, is, whether the Apostle St. Peter was at Rome, and the conclusion drawn is, that he was never in that city. The grounds upon which it is drawn are two: first, that the authorities testifying the fact of his having been

there are unworthy of credit; second, that his having been there is incompatible with the truth of the New Testament.

This question was never raised during upwards of thirteen hundred years, and through that whole period every Christian writer, that we know of, who had occasion to mention the subject, stated as notorious facts that were universally admitted, that St. Peter not only was at Rome, but that he was Bishop of Rome, and was put to death in the reign of Nero for his religion. It is said that a teacher of Wickliff, named William, asserted that Peter never was at Rome, and this is the earliest contradiction. Be that as it may; Ulric Velenus, a Lutheran, wrote a book to prove that this Apostle never saw that city; Illyricus also says he demonstrated it. Calvin only doubts upon the subject; and since his day, the question has been settled by various Protestants just as they pleased; but unquestionably some of their most erudite antiquarians are to be found in the English division, some of the best informed amongst whom state it to be unquestionable, in point of fact, that not only was he there, but that he was Bishop there, and died there.

I believe it is in Frey Gerundo the advice is given to a young preacher who would bring himself into notice, by exciting the astonishment of his congregation, to commence boldly by proclaiming, in a loud and dogmatic tone, some astounding heresy or error, and then, after a suitable pause, in a more subdued tone, informing his hearers that he means to controvert and to demolish what he has laid before them. If I mistake not, the exemplification which is given is the following:—"I deny that in the Godhead there are three persons! ! ! So says the Socinian, whose errors I mean to combat." Upon reading the commencement of Monsieur Blanc's dissertation, I was forcibly reminded of the Portuguese preceptor of the young friar who aspired to pulpit fame.

"It is upon the testimony of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, that the popish tradition rests, respecting St. Peter's being at Rome, his founding a church there, and for twenty-five years discharging in it the functions of a bishop. Papias was copied by Clement of Alexandria: Clement was copied by Eusebius,[9] and the latter has been copied by many authors, ancient and modern, who have been, perhaps, too much interested to render credible a fact, which will always be of very little importance to those who build their faith, not on the person of St. Peter, but upon the corner stone, Jesus Christ. The account of Papias, which is based upon a hearsay only, about eighty years after the occurrence to which it refers, is still extant, and is full of fables and ridiculous tales—such as the contest which this Apostle sustained against Simon the sorcerer, his crucifixion, with his head downwards—as if Nero had left to the Christians the care of settling the forms

[9] Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 14, 15, *et seq.*

of their own punishment—and other similar things, which were reported originally only by this Papias himself. Eusebius, speaking of him, calls him 'a man of narrow genius, and too credulous.' ''

Nobly demolished!—But allow me to gather up the fragments. First I must see who Papias was. He was Bishop of Hierapolis, and flourished about the beginning of the second century. St. Peter was put to death in the year 65 or 66. Papias died about the year 150, when he was considerably upwards of eighty years old, at the very lowest calculation; I might more safely say much older! Thus in place of being a gatherer of hearsay at the distance of eighty years after the time of Peter, this prelate was more properly speaking a cotemporary of the Apostle, though not his acquaintance, nor his hearer, but very young and living at a distance. He lived, according to all early writers, in the days of some of the Apostles, and had his accounts from those who saw and heard and lived with them: and from conversations with those persons he compiled his five books — *An Explication of the Oracles of God.* All the ancient writers concur in the testimony of the excellence of character of Papias, so that he is unquestionably an honest witness; but they also are agreed that his testimonies are to be received with caution, because of his shallow judgment and credulous disposition. The facts which he testifies are of two descriptions, respecting which a palpable distinction is easily made. Some of them were of such a nature as required no effort of judgment. Such as, knowing where one of the most remarkable of the Apostles resided and died: a simple, honest man who held the station of Bishop soon after Peter's death, and was a sedulous inquirer into the facts regarding the Apostles, could easily learn this and could as easily testify it. But in making inquiry regarding the sayings of the Apostles, he might by reason of his narrow judgment and credulous disposition be easily misled, as we find he was respecting the opinion of the millennium, of which he was the author. Thus Papias is rather to be considered a cotemporary of the Apostles, and fully competent to testify where Peter lived and died, than to be looked upon as a silly old man who is only a gatherer of hearsays respecting nearly a century before. Papias was a cotemporary and companion of St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist, and whom this Apostle constituted Bishop of Smyrna, probably in the year 96. He was also a teacher of St. Irenæus, who died Bishop of Lyons, who also derived much of his Christian knowledge from Polycarp; Irenæus was put to death in the year 202.

Having thus seen the character of Papias and his competency to be a witness of at least the fact where a well and publicly known man

who held a high place in the Christian Church lived and died, I come to examine this flippant Frenchman's dash respecting the testimony itself. "It is upon the testimony of Papias that the Popish tradition rests." Why, of a truth, if the handing down of a known fact be tradition, yea even this is tradition, for verily it handeth down the testified fact which was commonly and publicly known. The flimsy cobweb of the word tradition will not, my friends, hide from you the truth. A fact must be testified by some writer that it might become a portion of recorded history, and being so testified and recorded as known truth, it does not lose its quality of truth because of being handed down. Thus suppose we had no other original testimony, save that of this old writer, still would it not be the less true because it had come from him to us. This is the way in which the Scripture has come to us, by tradition or delivery, and it was naturally impossible that it could have been otherwise received by us. The question at present is not whether St. Peter was there twenty-five years, nor whether he founded a church there, nor whether he was crucified with his head downwards, nor whether the story of the contest with Simon is or is not true. Papias might have been misled upon all those points, and yet clearly know and plainly testify that Peter was at Rome and died there, though he might err in all the other particulars; I state this merely to narrow the question, not because I doubt the truth of any of the statements. The word tradition, then, if meant to be opposed to good history, is a gross misrepresentation, for in making this record the Bishop of Hierapolis is a coeval historian, who receives from eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses the testimony of the residence of Peter and of his death at Rome. I doubt if Mr. . . . . of Philadelphia, was ever in Mexico or saw Iturbide, yet he might, in writing a history of American revolutions, fairly put into such a book the testimony of his being emperor, and dethroned, exiled, having returned, and being slain. No one of us in the United States is ignorant of those facts: yet how few of us are even now acquainted with the true state of Mexico? Whilst, then, we give correct testimony of those facts, we are liable to mistake and be imposed upon by the accounts of a variety of opinions and conversations of some of the Scotch and Yorkist Masons, who have so much mysterious cabalism in the regulation of its affairs. Thus respecting the residence and death of the chief of the Apostles, Papias is a good historian, though he might have been deceived in some of the particulars.

I come next to the assertion that the whole tradition (history) rests upon the testimony of Papias. Never was any assertion more unfounded. We have a great variety of other evidence to support the

fact. The first arrival of St. Paul in Rome is mentioned in *Acts* xxviii. 14, 15, 16, and here it is distinctly stated that the brethren (Christians) came as far as Appii Forum and the Three Taverns to meet him; consequently there were Christians in that city before his arrival. Previously to this, he had written his *Epistle to the Romans*, where in chapter i. verses 7, 8, it is manifest that Rome was then a city which had a Christian Church "whose faith was spoken of through the whole world." Now the questions occur, who made those Christians? Who governed that Church? Certainly not Paul, who had not been there at that time. Not only Papias, but a great number of ancient writers inform us that Peter was their Apostle; this was stated to the knowledge of the people of Rome and of all the other churches, and not contradicted, but admitted by them all, and in the earliest ages was made a foundation for a claim on the part of Rome for supremacy over the other parts of the Church. Towards several portions of the universal Church, in the earliest ages, the Bishops of Rome used measures which appeared harsh and coercive, and yet we never find a single bishop or church in those early ages question the fact of Peter's residence and labours in Rome, though we find some of them displeased with the manner in which the authority derived from him was used against themselves. They lived near the apostolic days, they knew the character of Papias, and still we are gravely told that this simple prelate beguiled and misled them all!! Yet this is called criticism. I doubt not but we could find persons who would call it philosophy! Yes; the philosophy of history!! There are some people who seriously give that name to their own speculations against fact. Monsieur Blanc, however, forgets himself a little, for though he told us that it was upon the authority of Papias the Popish tradition of St. Peter's being at Rome, and so forth, rested, and gives us the account of Papias as based upon a hearsay about eighty years after the occurrence: that is, in the year 146, or thereabouts, he informs us in his next paragraph:

"According to the testimony of the same Eusebius, Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, an author of the second century, affirms also that St. Peter and St. Paul met at Corinth, and that they departed together for Rome, where they suffered martyrdom."

One passing remark here might not be amiss, viz., this very accurate antiquarian refers us to the 25th chapter of Book II. of Eusebius, as authority for his statement that "St. Peter and St. Paul met at Corinth." Not one syllable in support of such an assertion is to be found in any copy of Eusebius which has fallen under my eye, nor in support of the other averment that "they departed together for Rome." But the history of Eusebius does contain a passage from the said

Dionysius, stating that both those saints did instruct the Christians at Corinth, and were united in the building or planting the Church at Rome; and Eusebius also states, that the same author testifies their martyrdom at Rome. Thus we find the essayist gives us another witness besides Papias; and, therefore, the Popish tradition, even according to himself, does not rest on that prelate alone. This looks like a contradiction. Dionysius died in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, of course before the year 192, and at an advanced age. If Papias wrote at Hierapolis only from a hearsay, eighty years after the transaction, Dionysius in Corinth, who wrote several years before his death, his Epistle to the Romans, in which this testimony is found, must in all likelihood have learned it from other sources besides the book of the Bishop of Hierapolis. And how strangely must it sound to the Romans when the letter of the Bishop of Corinth was read to them, informing them of what, upon the supposition of our friend the Reverend Blanc, they knew to be false, viz., that St. Peter, who never was in their city, planted their Church and was put to death in a place where he never had been! ! Yet this same Dionysius appeared to know the history of the Roman Church very well, for in this same Epistle to the Romans, or rather to Soter their Bishop, he writes, in thanking them for the alms received from Rome for his Church:

"From the beginning it is your custom to bestow your alms in all places, and to furnish subsistence to many churches. You send relief to the needy, especially to those who work in the mines; in which you follow the example of your fathers. Your blessed Bishop Soter is so far from degenerating from your ancestors on that head, that he goes beyond them; not to mention the comfort and advice which he, with the bowels of a tender father towards his children, affords to all who come to him. On this day we celebrated together the Lord's day, and read your letter as we do that which was heretofore written to us by Clement."

It will be matter of more than curiosity to compare this with an early Protestant translation:

"It hath bene your accustomed manner, euen from the beginning: diuersely to benefit all the brethren, and to send relief throughout the citie, supplying the want of the poore by refreshing them in this sorte, and specially the want of the brethren appointed for slauish drudgerie, and digging of metalls. You Romaines, of olde do retaine the fatherly affection of Rome, which holy Soter you byshop not only obserued, but also augmented, ministring large and liberall relief to the vse of the sainctes: embracing louingly the conuerted brethren, as a father doth his sonnes, with exhortation of wholesome doctrine. Here also he remembreth the epistle of Clemens written to the Corinthians, showing the same of auncient custome, to have bene read in the Church, for thus he writeth: We have this day solemnized the holy Sunday, in the which we haue read your epistle and alwayes will for instructions sake, even as we do the former of Clemens written vnto us."

"The citie" is here substituted for "many churches;" any person

can tell why. The Bishop who wrote this did not need the hearsay nor the tradition of Papias to tell who was the first Bishop of Rome. Of a verity then, Dionysius copied not Papias, as of a truth Monsieur Blanc copied not either Eusebius or Dionysius where he affected to do. Dionysius, however, must also be demolished.

"But besides that Dionysius himself complains that his letters have been falsified by heretics, a circumstance which considerably invalidates the authority of his writings, this testimony ought not to outweigh the truth of our holy Scriptures, which, with the divine assistance, we shall bring forward below."

Then we must, it seems, throw the testimony of this writer away, because he complains that "his letters had been falsified by heretics." If the principle be good, we must give to it all due weight and value, and, therefore, must make no use of what he thus states to have been so falsified. Of course Mr. Blanc cannot reject one portion of the passage, and keep another, without giving some sufficient reason therefor. The following is the Protestant translation:—

"When I was intreated of the brethren to write, I wrote certain Epistles, but the messengers of Satan have sowen them with tares, pulling away some, putting to others some, whose condemnation is laid up of certaine. No marveil then though some endevored to corrupt the sacred Scriptures of God, when as went about to counterfeit such writings of so small authoritie."—Lib. iv. chap. 23.

Are we then to reject the Scriptures? Have not heretics endeavoured to falsify them? My answer is very simple. Attempts were made to change passages in those Epistles of Dionysius regarding doctrine and opinion, but concerning a plain fact, as well known at Rome, whither he wrote, as at Corinth, upon a subject regarding which Rome could not mistake, it would indeed be egregious folly to attempt any counterfeit, for such counterfeit would be at once detected, and would expose him who made it to condemnation and contempt. But what a case do our adversaries make out for us, if they call this a forgery?—It is equivalent to an avowal that in the days of this bishop, there was a body of men who falsified his letters to make it appear that Peter was at Rome, and that their system was like ours, founded upon his supremacy. Will not this destroy his assertion that is was begun by Papias?—See the other consequence of arguing as Monsieur Blanc does. We destroy the authority of the Scriptures of God. It is really, my friends, an avowal of what I am convinced is the fact, that to destroy the foundations of the Roman Catholic Church, you must subvert Christianity.

But to return. It is plain that the Epistle to Soter and the Roman people was not one of those that had been falsified, for they that were changed by heretics were his doctrinal epistles, but this is one merely

of thanks for alms. He then learned, not from Papias, but from public evidence, as did Papias himself; hence the French dissertation states that which is not the fact, when it gives Papias as the only original author of the statement.

I leave to the "clerical friend," and to his editor, to say how they can be certain that the copy of the Scriptures, which they possess, is free from heretical corruptions, if copies had been corrupted by heretics so early as the time of Dionysius. For my part, I avow I could have no certainty respecting the copy which I use, did I not acknowledge the infallible authority of a tribunal which then guarded their purity, and continues to do so to-day, but which tribunal is valueless in the eye of those erudite antiquarians.

Before I proceed to adduce the other testimony, I desire to close my remarks upon the passages which I have adduced from Monsieur Blanc.

"Papias was copied by Clement of Alexandria, Clement was copied by Eusebius."

The essayist refers for his authority in making these statements to Eusebius, (*Hist. Ecc.* lib. ii., c. 14, 15, *et seq.*). How far *et seq.* might extend, I know not. But I do know that, after a diligent reading of Eusebius, I find no authority for the statement. But in the fifteenth chapter I find the following passage:—

Chapter XV, *The foyle of Simon, and mention of the Gospell VVritten by St. Marke:*

"When the heauenly worde came thither, immediately the power of Simon, together with him selfe came to nought, and the flame was quenched. But of the contrarie such a light of piety shined in the mindes of such as heard Peter, that they were not suffized with once hearing, neither satisfied with the unwritten doctrine that was deliuered: but earnestly besought Sainct Marke (whose *Gospell* is now in use) that he would leaue in writing, vnto them, the doctrine which they had receaued by preaching, neither ceassed they, vntill they had perswaded him, and so geuen an occasion of the *Gospell* to be written, which is now after Marke. It is reported, that the Apostle vnderstanding of this by inspiration of the holy spirite, was pleased with the motion of those men, and commanded this Gospell now written, to be read in the Churches. Clemens in the sixth of his *Hypotiposeon*, reporteth this story. With him agreeth Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Asia, who sayeth, that of this Marke mention is made by Peter, in his former Epistle, which he compiled being at Rome, and of him the citie of Rome figuratively to be called Babylon, the which is signified when he sayth: the Church partaker of your election, which is at Babylon, saluteth you, and Marke my sonne."

There is no authority here for stating that the writer of the Hypotiposeon copied from Papias, and when Monsieur Blanc made the assertion, he wrote the thing which is not. Neither was Clement the author of that book, though it bears his name. Eusebius wrote in the century succeeding that in which Clement died, and quotes him; but I shall show a large body of intervening testimony in several places during the

interval, so that to assert as is here done by the dissertator, is to suggest a falsehood, that this was the only course of the testimony, and is also to suppress the truth, that there was a large host of other witnesses: and besides, the fact here referred to is not the founding of the church, but the writing of the Gospel by St. Mark, at Rome, under the direction of St. Peter.

As to the remarks concerning Simon Magus, and the crucifixion of St. Peter, I shall find a more proper period for my observations than at the close of this letter.

I remain, my friends,

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER III.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 17, 1828.

My Friends:—I have shown that Mr. Blanc's references to Eusebius are not to be relied upon; that Papias was a cotemporary of some of the Apostles, and could easily ascertain who was the first Bishop of Rome; that he was an honest witness, and even according to the reverend dissertator, was not the only witness who, living in the apostolic days, testified the fact of Peter's residence at Rome; for Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, who testifies it, was also a cotemporary with at least one of the Apostles.

The next attempt to destroy testimony is the effort to make Pope Clement of Rome say what is the very contradictory to his meaning.

"To all these pretensions, we can oppose, in the first place, the testimony of Clement, who is reckoned to have been the third or fourth Bishop of Rome. This pious and holy person, in his admirable *Epistle to the Corinthians*, expresses himself thus, on the subject of St. Peter and St. Paul:—'Through unjust envy, Peter did not endure one or two, but a very great number of trials, and at last, having suffered martyrdom, he went to his place in glory. Through the same envy, Paul received the reward of his patience, having been in prison or in chains seven times, beaten twice, stoned once: and after he had been the herald of the word of God in the east and in the west, he obtained by faith an illustrious victory. Having reached the extremity of the west, he suffered martyrdom under the emperors. Thus he departed from this world, and went to a holy place, leaving us a singular example of patience.' What is the likelihood, that in the parallel which Clement draws between these two Apostles, he should forget to say that under the emperors he (Peter) suffered the pains of martyrdom? Would he have neglected a fact, in this manner, which would have given additional weight to his epistle, and done honour to his see?"

The passage of Clement is to be explained by the circumstances under which it was written, by the comment of cotemporaneous writers, and of those who lived soon after the period of its publication. Allow

me first to remark, without questioning the accuracy of the translation, that this passage does not by any means deny, even by implication, the facts of Peter's residence and death at Rome; so that in truth it was preserved, viz., that both the Apostles, Peter and Paul, suffered martyrdom at Rome, where he had resided, under the Emperor Nero," which is our assertion, and this other: "Peter having suffered martyrdom, he went to the place of his glory," which is Clement's assertion. The clause under the emperors can without any impropriety be referred to both saints: for in truth they both suffered in the same place. As to the apparant neglect of Clement, the answer is very simple: the fact of Peter's having suffered at Rome was so well known that it was as unnecessary to mention it at that period to Christians, as it would this day be necessary to inform a Frenchman that Louis XVI. was beheaded in Paris.

The occasion of the letter was a schism at Corinth, in or about the year 96. This letter is one of which Dionysius, bishop of that see, makes mention in the next century as having been still read in his church, and we have seen that this prelate informs us what meaning the passage bore in the assembly to which it was addressed, and by which is was preserved, viz., that both the Apostles, Peter and Paul, suffered martyrdom in Rome. This Clement was mentioned by St. Paul, (*Phil.* iv. 3). His Epistle was read in several of the early churches, and was held in such esteem as to be contained in a very ancient Alexandrian manuscript copy of the Bible, sent by Cyril Lucar to James I., of England; it was carried from Rome to Corinth by Fortunatus, of whom St. Paul makes mention, (*I Cor.* xvi. 17), accompanied by four messengers from Rome, whom Clement requested the Corinthians speedily to send back to him with good tidings; in all the churches in which it was read, the belief existed that the martyrdom of both the Apostles occurred in Rome. Eusebius, Book iii. chapter 14, states:—

Chapter XIIII. *Of Clemens, his Bishopricke, his testimony, his Epistle.*

"In the twelfe yeare of the raygne of Dominitian, when as Anacletus had bene Bishop of Rome twelue years: Clemens succeeded, whome S. Paul, writing to the Philippians, calleth his felow laborer, when he sayth: with Clemens, and the rest of my felow laborers, whose names are written in the booke of life, one undoubted epistle ther is of his, extant, both worthy and notable the which he wrote from Rome, unto Corinthe, when sedition was raysed among the Corinthians: the same Epistle we haue knowne to haue bene reade openly, and publikely, in many churches, both of old, and amongest us also. That at that tyme ther was raysed a sedition amongst the Corinthians, Aegesippus is a witness of creditt."

And this author distinctly testifies the martyrdom to have taken place in Rome, (lib. iii. chapter 1), upon the authority, amongst others,

of Origen. It would be altogether too tedious to enumerate the others who, in the first three centuries, testify this to have been the sense of the passage which Mr. Blanc, by a new species of logic, converts into a contradiction. St. Jerome, Photius, and others of highest authority for erudition and research, give this as its meaning. Amongst the Protestants, Dodwell, Bishop Pearson, Cave, Archbishop Wake, Grabe, and others, follow those ancient and venerable witnesses. Thus, the passage in Clement's Epistle is one which bears testimony for us, and not against us. Eusebius, when he wrote, had this document, as well as several others, before him, all tending to uphold our position; and yet Mr. Blanc has the modesty to state that this historian only copied Clement of Alexandria who copied Papias, who made his statement upon a hearsay eighty years after the alleged occurrence! ! ! What says Eusebius himself?

"Chapter I. *In what countreyes the Apostles preached Christ.*

"When as the Jewish affrayres stood as before is declared, the Holy Apostles and Disciples of our Sauiour, were dispersed troughout the world. Thomas (as by tradition we receaue) chose Parthia: Andrew, Scythia: John, Asia: where he made his abode, and died at Ephesus. Peter is reported to haue preached to the dispersed Iewes throughout Pontus, Gallacia, Mithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia, who about his latter time, tarrying at Rome, was crucified with his head downewards, which kind of death, he him selfe desired. What shall I say of Paule, which from Ierusalem to Illyricum, filled all places with the Gospel of Christ. And at the last suffred martyrdome at Rome under Nero? These thinges are manifestly, and word by word declared by Origen, in the third tome of his commentaries upon Genesis."

"Chap. II. *VVho was the first Bishop of Rome.*

"Linus first, after the martyrdome of Peter and Paule, was chosen Bishop of Rome, Paule about the latter end in the salutation of the epistle which he wrote vnto Timothe, fro Rome, maketh mention of him, saying: Eubulus saluteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia."

This is a very extraordinary mode of upholding the assertion, that Eusebius copied Clement of Alexandria! You may easily observe then, my friends, the little value of this writer's statements.

Ignatius was a disciple of St. Peter and St. Paul, as also of St. John the Evangelist, with whom he was extremely intimate, and was second Bishop after Peter of the Church of Antioch.—Evodius, who, in the year 43, succeeded Peter, having been succeeded by this Ignatius. St. John Chrysostom (*Hom. in S. Ignat.*) and Theodoret (*Dial*, 1, p. 23) inform us that the appointment of Ignatius was made by St. Peter, and that he was consecrated by him and St. Paul; he governed the See of Antioch during upwards of forty years, and suffered martyrdom in Rome on the 20th of December, 107. In his Epistle to the Romans, after he had been sentenced in Antioch to be carried to Rome and de-

livered to be devoured by beasts at the public games, he alludes, in the following passage, to the authority which Peter and Paul, who had so long been the special rulers of their church, had over them: "Pray to Christ for me, that in this I may become a sacrifice to God. I do not as Peter and Paul command you; they were Apostles, I am an inconsiderable person." The whole body of ancient writers inform us that this was an allusion to the command given by those apostles to the Christians at Rome, not to interfere, by exertion, or intreaty, or prayer, to prevent their being sacrificed. Eusebius, when he wrote, had this document also, (lib. iii. cap. 36). In his fourth book, chapter 21 and 22, he mentions the five books of the church history compiled by Hegesippus, who came to Rome in the pontificate of Anicetus, about the year 160, and remained there until 177, when he returned to the East, and died probably at Jerusalem, in the year 180, at a very advanced age. Eusebius states he copied very much from him; and it is in his work the principal written testimony is first found as to the request of Peter, that he be crucified with his head downwards. In Book iii. chapter 2, of Hegesippus, the relation was given. Thus, in Rome itself, and from the persons of all others best qualified to give the account, this author wrote his statement which Eusebius saw; and yet Monsieur Blanc informs us, that he only copied Clement of Alexandria, who copied Papias, who built his tradition on a hearsay about eighty years after the occurrence, and in Hierapolis! Of a truth this is a most historical critic.

About fifty years after the time of Dionysius of Corinth, Caius wrote, of whom Eusebius gives us the following account and testimony in Book ii. chapter 25:

"This enemy of God (Nero) (wherein he was first espied) set vp him selfe to the destruction of the Apostles, for they write that Paule was beheaded, and Peter crucified of him at Rome, and that maketh for the credit of our history which is commonly reported, that there be churchyards vnto this day, bearing the name of Peter and Paul. In like manerr Gaius, a Romane, and an Ecclesiasticall person, and (after Zepherinus,) Bishop of Rome, writing unto Proclus captaine of the heresie which the Cataphrygæns held, speaketh thus of the tombes wherein the Apostles were layd. I (sayth he) am able to shewe the banners of the Apostles. For if thou wilt walke vnto Vaticanum, or the waye Ostienses, thou shalt finde there victorious banners, of such as haue builded this Church. And that they were both crowned with martirdome at the same time, Dionysius bishop of Corinth affirmeth in his epistle vnto the Romanes."

This passage is more correctly translated thus:

"Therefore, (Nero,) when he professed himself the open enemy of the divinity and piety, sought first the death of the very Apostles, as being the leaders and standard-bearers amongst the people of God: and condemned Paul to lose his head in the city of Rome, and Peter to the punishment of the cross. I think it useless

to search extrinsic evidence of those things, since their most splendid monuments testify the fact to-day."

Yet Mr. Blanc tells us that he only copied Clement of Alexandria, who copied Papias! !

St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, was born about the year 120, in Asia Minor, and was a disciple of the famous St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, the pupil of St. John the Evangelist. Polycarp was the angel of the Church of Smyrna, (*Rev.* ii. 9), so commended by "the Son of Man." He visited Pope Anicetus, in Rome, about the year 158, and certainly was well aware of who was first Bishop of that See; he suffered martyrdom about the year 166, when, according to his own testimony, he had served Christ eighty-six years, and was at least one hundred years old. Basnage, a learned Protestant writer, thinks he was an hundred and twenty years old, which would have made him a cotemporary of St. Peter. From him and other eminent prelates, Irenæus learned the facts and doctrines of Christianity. Tertullian, (lib. *contra Valent.* chapter 5), calls Irenæus "the most diligent searcher of all doctrines." St. Epiphanius calls him "a most learned and eloquent man, endowed with all the gifts of the Holy Ghost." Theodoret styles him, "the light of the Western Gauls." The commerce between Marseilles and Smyrna was extensive in the second century, and Irenæus was advised by Polycarp to proceed to Gaul, where many Christians were extending their faith. He was ordained priest by Pothinus, Bishop of Lyons, and in 177 was sent to Rome on business, from the Church of Lyons to Pope Eleutherius; thus in the city itself, he had the full opportunity of investigating the history of its bishops. The Bishop of Lyons having been martyred during the absence of Irenæus, he was selected upon his return from Rome to govern that See; and was slain with a vast number of his flock, in the fifth persecution under Severus, about the year 202. This writer, in Book iii. chapter 3, states, that the Apostles left their doctrine and the truth of all the mysteries of faith to their successors the pastors, and that it is fit we should have recourse to them to learn; especially "to the greatest church, the most ancient and known to all, founded at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, which retains the tradition it received from them, and which is derived through a succession of bishops down to us. Showing which, we confound all who, any way out of self-conceit, love of applause, blindness, or false persuasions, embrace what ought not to be advanced; for to this church, because if its better presidency, it is necessary that every church—that is, the faithful everywhere—should address themselves; in which church the tradition from the Apostles is altogether preserved."

He then states that SS. Peter and Paul chose Linus to succeed at their death; and he enumerates Anacletus, Clement, Evaristus, Alexander, Sixtus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter, and Eleutherius, whom he calls the twelfth from the Apostles. This list is also found in Eusebius, (lib. v. chapter 6), copied, as he alleges, from Irenæus. Thus you observe, my friends, how extremely incorrect is the assertion of the Reverend Mr. Blanc as to the authority upon which this historian bases his statements.

Eusebius states (lib. ii. chapter xvi), from ancient accounts whose truth he considers to be extremely probable, that Philo the Jew who came from Egypt in the beginning of the reign of the Emperor Claudius, met and conferred at Rome with St. Peter who then preached to the Romans. This was in the year 43 of the common era.

Arnobius the famous Numidian rhetorician, who was converted to Christianity in or about the year 302, in his Book ii. against the Gentiles mentions the extensive progress of religion in Rome to have been in a great measure caused by the exposure and defeat of Simon Magus, by St. Peter, in that city.

Tertullian, born at Carthage about the year 160, son of a centurion, a man of most comprehensive genius, extensive erudition, and deep research, profoundly versed in the Roman laws and the principles of evidence, in his book *On Prescriptions*, states that Peter was crucified at Rome, and states that Clement was one of his successors in that see. He has in his book of Prescriptions the following passage:

"If you are near Italy, you have Rome; whence too we have authority convenient. Happy church for which the Apostles poured out their entire doctrine, together with their blood! Where Peter is assimilated to his suffering Lord, and Paul is crowned in a death like John's."

St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, was son of one of the principal senators of that city, and only at an advanced period of life embraced the Christian faith. His education was of the first order and his talents excellent; his intercourse with the Church of Rome was very considerable, after he had been elevated to the see, of his native city; nor was it all of the most forbearing and obsequious character. In a variety of places he styles Rome "the See of Peter," "the Chair of Peter," "the principal church whence the priestly unity hath arisen." In his Book iv. Epistle 2, to Antonianus we read: "Cornelius was made bishop, when the place of Fabian, that is the place of Peter, and the degree of the sacerdotal chair was vacant." This prelate was put to death in the year 258.

Lactantius, a disciple of Arnobius, at Sicca, in Africa, was converted

from Paganism to Christianity at Nicomedia, about the year 290. About the year 317 he became preceptor to Crispus Cæsar, in Gaul, by the appointment of Constantine. One of his greatest works is that *Of Divine Institutions*, published first in 320. I select from chapter 21, of Book iv. the following passages:

"Christ at the time of his departure manifested to his disciples the things that were to happen, which Peter and Paul preached at Rome." . . . . .

"After Nero had slain them (Peter and Paul), Vespasian extinguished the name and nation of the Jews, and did all those things which they foretold were to take place."

St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, was born about the year 296, and amongst other passages of his writings is the following, taken from his letter to the Hermits.

"At first they did not spare even Liberius, the Bishop of Rome; not being moved by any reverence, for that his see was apostolic."

In the same he introduces Liberius declaring,

"Never has such been handed down to us by the fathers, who have received their tradition from the blessed and great Peter."

Origen, the fellow student of Plotinus and Longinus, the disciple of Ammonius Saccas, was certainly no mere copyist without cause. This great master of the Catechetical school of Alexandria, was born in the year 184: about the year 212, he went to Rome, in the Pontificate of Zepherinus, and was unquestionably well qualified to ascertain its ecclesiastical history. It is upon his authority also that Eusebius relates the manner in which St. Peter was crucified with his head downwards, at his own request. (Lib. 3, *in Genes.*)

"And Peter having waited at Rome to the last, was crucified there, his head being downwards, which was so besought by himself, lest he should appear to be equalled to his Lord."

I suspect it required no special indulgence from Nero to leave the executioner the power of agreeing to the request of one to suffer, so far as regarded the position of his body: it is a miserable sneer of sophistry to insinuate that such an acquiescence on the part of the executioner was equivalent to "allowing Christians the care of settling their own forms of punishment."

All these and a great many more who bear similar testimony lived before, or together with Eusebius the historian, who was born in the year 270. Their works and those of several others were in his hands. How absurd then is the statement that he was a mere copyist of a copyist of hearsay?

I come now to exhibit the effort which the essayist makes to destroy the entire value of all the witnesses. He had previously made his assaults upon Papias, Dionysius of Corinth, and Eusebius. But this

he feels will not serve his purpose, and he, as if in a mere transient manner, as a matter too plain to be questioned, too palpable to require proof, states that not a single passage from any of the ancient writers is of any avail when adduced by a Roman Catholic, but if it be adduced by a Protestant, it is conclusive. You will probably, my friends, think this a very extraordinary position. But do not pass a hasty judgment.

"Let us also make, in passing, the remark, that when the Fathers are produced against us in order to support dogmas or facts, which our opponent feels himself interested in maintaining, we ought to be the more upon our guard, because the Council of Trent has decided that the books of the ancient fathers ought to be *purged*, (*expurgati;*) a circumstance that, consequently, should make us very circumspect in the admission of passages which they cite against us; while, on the other hand, the passages of these fathers which we allege, remain in all their force, since we possess the books of the ancients only from the hands of our adversaries."

Now suppose the Council of Trent made such a decision, and that it was carried into execution; all that could follow would be, that after the close of that council the works would have been garbled: that is, passages would have been omitted. But my argument rests upon the passages which have been retained, and unless the witnesses contradicted themselves, none of the expunged passages could have asserted what contradicts those retained. Hence, even were I to admit the truth of this statement, his conclusion would be unsupported.

Again. The Council of Trent did not close its session until the year 1563, at which period a large portion of Europe and several of its universities were Protestant, and a great number of ancient copies of the works of the fathers were in the hands of the Protestants, as well in the libraries of those universities and cathedrals, as in those of the monasteries, colleges, and schools, which they siezed on, and in the hands of many private individuals. The council could not *purge* all those copies of the obnoxious passages which they contained: why not adduce those passages and thus convict the Catholics of this alleged garbling? Those works and printed copies of them are at this day in the hands of Protestants, and they have been so during the existence of the Protestant churches; when such is the case, of what use would be the purging of the copies held by Catholics?

Monsieur Blanc perhaps thinks that using the Latin word *expurgati* will be sufficient proof that the council made such a decree. It is painful, but it is necessary to inform you that the council made no such decree, or decision. Writers like Mr. Blanc and the "clerical brother," and the editor of the *Christian Advocate* are too fond of using this mode of attack upon us. It would have been as easy, and more satisfactory to have referred to the session when the decree was made, to

the page of the work in which it might be found, or to the head under which is was classed, as to write the Latin word *expurgati.*

Thus it is very plain that in three paragraphs of this dissertation we have a very large number of glaring misstatements, as well as the manifestation of a desire to destroy the credit of all the ancient witnesses and documents of church history, merely because they manifestly prove the truth of a fact which our "clerical brother" hates to admit. It is a little extraordinary that men who belong to a Christian society, should be so anxious to extinguish all the ancient lights of the Church, and to create a chaos or to leave a blank between the period at which St. Luke concludes his account of the Acts of the Apostles, and the present day; or a comparatively recent period!

Having thus shown the disingenuity, the sophistry, and want of honesty of Mr. Blanc, in his first assertions, I shall proceed to examine another very flippant expression of his essay:

"Clement was copied by Eusebius, and the latter has been copied by many authors, ancient and modern, who have been, perhaps, too much interested to render credible a fact which will always be of very little importance to those who build their faith, not on the person of Peter, but upon the corner stone, Jesus Christ."

In the first place I would remark, that I know of no persons who build their faith upon the person of St. Peter. If it be meant to insinuate that Roman Catholics do, the insinuation is untrue. When Christ changed the name of Simon to Peter, or rock, he declared (*Matt.* xvi. 18) that upon that rock he would build his church; and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. Roman Catholics believe that our blessed Lord did build his church upon that Peter or rock, by making Peter its first chief pastor after his own ascension; but he never desired the people to build their faith or belief upon that rock, but upon Jesus Christ himself. When a Roman Catholic makes an act of faith, he declares that he believes the articles of his religion, because God has revealed them: and thus the truth of God is the foundation of his faith. Christ then built the church upon St. Peter, but Roman Catholics build their faith upon the Saviour himself. Now let us see who are the ancient authors who were the witnesses of the general belief of their day, as to the fact of Peter's having resided at Rome, and who, receiving this testimony of their predecessors, conveyed it to us? I shall name but a very few out of many; and this I shall do in my next.

Eusebius principally used the compilation of Julianus Africanus, and the history of the church written by St. Hegesippus, the former in his *Chronicle,* the latter, so far as it came, viz., to the year 170, in his history: but he had also in his possession the writings of the various

authors above quoted, most of which he quotes himself. I would then ask you, fellow-citizens, candid, impartial, and desirous as you are of arriving at truth, what is to be thought of a man who, like this Monsieur Blanc, boldly makes what you now perceive to be a grossly untrue assertion? viz., that Eusebius only copied Clement of Alexandria, on this subject, Clement having only copied Papias, and Papias only writing upon a hearsay about eighty years after the death of Peter! Will not you, my friends, conclude with me, even before examining the subsequent writers, that this Frenchman was either very ignorant, or, ——— I shall not write the alternative. I do not like to call men who differ from me, beasts, idolaters, unhallowed usurpers, deluders, babel, unblushing liars, and such other names. I am not sufficiently polished for this; I am a plain republican, who do not like to call nick-names, though I might see that a man writes what he ought not. The history of Eusebius was brought down to the epoch of the defeat of Lisinus, in 323; all the authorities which I have quoted, hitherto, were anterior to this event. I shall in my next take a cursory view of those subsequent to that period.

I remain, my friends,

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

LETTER IV.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 25, 1828.

My Friends:—In my last letter I adduced the testimony of several highly respectable witnesses of the first three centuries of the church, to support the facts of St. Peter's residence and death at Rome. Thus it was also shown that since their writings were known to Eusebius, and either copied or referred to by him, Mr. Blanc's statement that this historian was only the copyist, in this instance, of Clement of Alexandria, is altogether untrue.

The essayist concedes to us, from that period forward, the host of writers who admit the truth of the fact; however, this concession is made with a very bad grace, for, in the first place, it is asserted that in obedience to a decision of the Council of Trent, their works have been garbled, and in the next place, that the ancient and modern authors who have copied from Eusebius, were generally too much interested to render the fact credible. I have already disposed of this first statement.

I shall here make what appears to me a very natural observation. It is conceded by our essayist that at the early period of the fourth century it was publicly stated that St. Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome:

he would not, I presume, deny that the bishops of Rome did at that period claim a supremacy in the church, because of their being the successors in his see; he would not, I suppose, deny that then, and for many years after, several bishops and their flocks not only submitted to that claim, but strenuously supported it. Is it then not passing strange, that from the mass of ancient authors he cannot cite one passage to question the truth of what all the ancient writers assert? Surely the Council of Trent, which was opened in 1545, could not have purged the fathers before the time of Arius in 320, of Macedonius in 360, of Nestorius in 430, of Eutychius in 450, of Heraclius in 640, of Constans in 668, of Leo the Isaurian in 740, or of Photius in 880. All those men and their followers and adherents, opposed the bishops of Rome, and were condemned by those prelates. Yet not one syllable do they urge in denial of the martyrdom of Peter at Rome: not one of them attempts to deny the notorious fact that the bishops of that see were, in their episcopacy thereof, the successors of that Apostle. I presume we shall not be told that those opponents were interested in making it credible!

Shall we be told that the prelates, the divines, and the critics of the Protestant Church of England are interested in rendering it credible? No nation, no church, can boast of brighter genius, more varied talent, deeper erudition, and more general scholarship, than is to be found in the ratio of their numbers in that national church. It is true that in the fury of their early efforts against Popery, as was the phrase of the day, neither John Knox in Scotland, nor the Mussulman in the East, made a more holy havoc of the documents of ancient days. As the Bible with the one, and the Koran with the other, were the only books which contained true knowledge, and were worthy of the believer's attention; so after being stripped of the mammon of iniquity with which their covers and cases were enriched, whole hecatombs of other ungodly parchments were offered as holocausts to the spirit of innovation. Yet still, as the monkish collection was immense, and the zeal of the ravagers was after a time restrained, the learned men, who subsequently arose in the English Church, had ample opportunities for indulging their critical and antiquarian research. To the testimony of Archbishop Wake, Bishop Pearson, Dodwell, Cave, and a host of this description, I would merely add the following remark of the acute Whiston.—(*Memoirs* of his own life, p. 599.)

"Mr. Bower, with some weak Protestants before him, almost pretended to deny that St. Peter was ever at Rome; concerning which matter take my own former words out of my three *Tracts*, page 53. Mr. Baratier proves most thoroughly, as Bishop Pearson has done before him, that Saint Peter was at Rome. This is so

clear in Christian antiquity, that it is a shame for any Protestant to confess that any Protestant ever denied it. This partial procedure demonstrates that Mr. Bower has by no means got clear of the prejudices of some Protestants; as an impartial writer of history, which he strongly pretends to be, ought to do, and has in this case greatly hurt the Protestant cause instead of helping it.''

Baratier was an eminent Protestant divine, whose dissertation was printed at Utrecht in 1740. It is entitled, *A Chronological Inquiry about the most ancient Bishops of Rome, from Peter to Victor.* In it he demonstrates the fact which had been so ably exhibited in the learned dissertation of Bishop Pearson.

Will it be pretended then that English, French, and German Protestant divines are interested in rendering this fact credible? The Reverend Mr. Blanc is not more opposed to the See of Rome than they were: the *Christian Advocate* is not more inimical to what he and they call Popery, than were those writers. But they were men who had read extensively and searched deeply upon the subject.

I shall now adduce the testimony of men whom the essayist would, perhaps, with some show of ground, assert were interested, because they were Roman Catholics. Are we then to reject the evidence furnished by the best witnesses of the brightest days of Christianity, merely because it will lead to a conclusion at which some gentlemen do not choose to arrive?

St. Epiphanius was born at Eleutheropolis, in Palestine, in the year 310. In his youth he closely studied the Hebrew, the Egyptian, the Syriac, the Greek, and the Latin languages, for the purpose of being better able to study the Holy Scriptures. He retired into a monastery in the desert of Egypt, whence he returned to Palestine in 333, and built a monastery near the place of his birth, in which his time was divided between labour, study, and prayer. About the year 367, he was chosen Bishop of Constantia, now Salamis, in the island of Cyprus. In 382 he accompanied St. Paulinus of Nola to Rome, during the pontificate of Damascus. Scarcely a book of note was to be found which he had not studied, and he had improved his reading by travel and observation. His death occurred in 403. In his account of the twenty-seventh heresy, which is that of Carpocrates, he distinctly states —

''Peter and Paul were the first in Rome.''

He follows up the assertion by stating—

''The succession of Bishops in Rome had this consecution. Peter and Paul, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Evaristus, Alexander,'' and so forth.

This is pretty strong testimony, given by a man of extensive knowledge and reading, whose research was close and protracted, and whose opportunities were abundant and ample.

St. Jerome was born in the year 329, or 331, and lived to the year 420, enjoying extraordinary advantages of extensive information in Rome, in Palestine, and in various other places where the best opportunities of knowledge were to be found. He writes of himself, Book 12. chapter 40, *Ezechiel*: "When a boy I studied the liberal arts at Rome; I was wont to make a round to visit the tombs of the apostles and martyrs, with others of the same age and inclinations, and often to descend into the caves which are dug deep into the earth, and have for walls on each side the bodies of those that are interred there." His close application to the study of the Holy Scriptures has never been exceeded, perhaps never equalled: no one better knew the whole range of ecclesiastical affairs. In his notices of illustrious men we read the following brief but emphatic and explicit testimony.

"Simon Peter went to Rome in order to vanquish Simon Magus, and there he held the sacerdotal chair during twenty-five years, that is, to the fourteenth or last year of Nero, by whom he was fastened to the cross, and suffered martyrdom, with his head down towards the earth."

In his *Epistle to Marcella* we read the following testimony regarding Rome, which, however, as the centre of former pagan infidelity, he styles the Babylon of the Apocalypse.

"There exists indeed there the holy church, there are the trophies of the Apostles and of the martyrs, there the true confession of Christ, there too the faith preached by the Apostle, and the Christian name daily raising itself on high, having trodden on the Gentile system."

In his *Epistle I.* to Pope Damascus, the 37th Bishop of Rome, concerning the name hypostasis: he has the following testimony:

"I speak with the successor of the fisherman and the disciple of the cross: I am joined in communion with your holiness, that is to the Chair of Peter."

St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, was born in Gaul in the year 340, where his father, who was at the time prefect of the Prætorium, kept his court. Ambrose himself, when Governor of Liguria and Æmilia, was chosen for the See of Milan, and consecrated in the year 374; he died in 397. His instruction was had in Rome, and no person could be more fully qualified that he was by education, by habit, and by principle, to investigate the origin of the church. It is from his oration against Auxentius which is found in his epistles, Book 5, we read one of those accounts of St. Peter, at which the Rev. Monsieur Blanc, the clerical brother, and the *Christian Advocate*, would affect to sneer as a "ridiculous tale," "a fable," and so forth. But our wise friends ought to be aware that we have received the Holy Scriptures, which contain many similar statements, only from the same hands, and by the same testimony which transmits to us those tales and fables, as the sage and

critical trio are pleased to designate them. St. Ambrose is stating an occurrence which took place after the Christians had prevailed upon Peter to leave the city of Rome in order to escape.

"He began to go beyond the walls by night, and seeing Christ meet him in the gateway, as if entering the city, he said: Lord, whither goest thou? Christ answered; I come to Rome for the purpose of being again crucified. Peter understood the divine answer to relate to his own cross, and so forth. . . . . Being quickly seized upon, he by his cross honoured the Lord Jesus."

In his Book III., *On the Sacraments*, chapter i., he has the following testimony, showing the ground upon which he made a statement.

"Truly we have as the author of this our assertion, Peter the Apostle, who was the Priest of the Roman Church."

St. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, was born of illustrious parents, at Bordeaux, in the year 353, educated in the most famous schools, and possessing all the advantages of talent, fortune, books, and communication with the most learned men of his time, in various places where he resided: he entered upon retirement from his worldly grandeur in the year 390, was consecrated in 409, and died in 431. In his book *Natali*, 3, he gives us the following testimony.

"And Rome herself, powerful in the sacred monuments of the heavenly leaders, in Peter and in Paul."

St. John Chrysostom was born about the year 344, at Antioch; he was the only son of Secundus the commander-in-chief of the imperial troops of Syria. His name is his eulogy; his knowledge was indeed extensive, as his tongue was eloquent: he was ordained deacon in 381; priest in 386; and was consecrated Bishop of Constantinople on the 26th of February, 398; and died on the 14th of September, 407. In his *Commentary* on the 18th *Psalm* we read.

"Because Peter the fisherman took possession of the chief royal city, he shines, even after death, more splendid than the sun."

In his Homily 32, *On the Epistle to the Romans*, he states:

"The heavens do not shine so brightly when the sun shoots forth his rays, as doth the city of the Romans, pouring out the light of those two lamps through all the world. From this place Paul will be snatched, from this place Peter. Consider, and be astonished what a spectacle Rome will behold, to wit, Paul arising suddenly from the repository together with Peter, and borne upwards to meet the Lord."

Eutropius, an excellent historian, born in the same century, who wrote ten books of the history of Rome down to the time of the Emperor Valens, gives the following testimony in his book vii. *On the life of Nero.*

"Finally he added this to all his other crimes, that he butchered the holy Apostles of God, Peter and Paul."

St. Sulpicius Severus, of a rich and illustrious Roman family, was

born near Toulouse in Aquitain, about the year 360: he was a most acute and eloquent barrister, of extensive reading and deep erudition. Upon the death of his wife he retired and devoted himself altogether to piety and literature; some writers state that he was ordained priest, but doubts exist upon the subject: he compiled an ecclesiastical history and some works of hagiography. The language of his abridged history, to the year 400, is such as to deserve a comparison in style with the best of the earlier ages, and procured for him the appellation of the Christian Sallust; his death occurred about the year 420, when it is generally supposed he was a monk in a monastery, founded near Marseilles, by Cassian, who came thither from Constantinople, about twelve years previously. I shall give his testimony in the original, together with the translation, (lib. 2. *Sac. His.*)

Divina apud urbem religio invaluerat, Petro ibi Episcopatum gerente; et Paulo postea Roman adducto. . . . . Paulus ac Petrus capitis damnati, quorum uni cervix gladio desecta, Petrus in crucem sublatus est.

"The divine religion had grown strong in the city, Peter being bishop there, and Paul having been afterwards led to Rome . . . . . Paul and Peter were capitally sentenced, of whom one was beheaded with a sword; Peter was lifted on a cross."

The Emperor Theodosius the Great, reigned from 395 to 408, and from his situation must have had good opportunities of knowing the general impression of the wise and the learned of his own day, as well as the history of previous times. This emperor must, if local prejudices or partialities swayed him, have been less disposed to favour Rome than Constantinople. Let us view his testimony given in *G. de summa Trinitate, et fide Catholica, L. cunctos populos.*

"We desire all the people who are under the rule of our clemency to be exercised in that religion, whose preservation as yet amongst the Romans declares it to have been to them delivered by the blessed Apostle Peter."

St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, was born at Tagaste in Numidia in the year 354: his education was most carefully looked after, his talents were of the first order, and his research was extensive and accurate. Having been instructed in the Christian doctrine by St. Ambrose, as well as by an aged priest named Simplican, whom Pope Damasus had formerly sent to instruct Ambrose himself, he became a Christian, and was baptized by St. Ambrose, on Easter eve, in the year 387: in the course of two or three years afterwards he was ordained priest, and was consecrated Bishop in the year 395, and died in the year 430. I might quote many passages from his voluminous writings to sustain the facts which I here uphold. I shall be content with the following:

"Rome commends more solemnly, and with greater celebrity, the merits of

Peter and of Paul, because they suffered on the same day. Book i. Chapter 10. *De Consensu Evangel.*''

''What hath the chair of the Church of Rome done to you, that chair in which Peter sat, and in which Anastasius now sits? Book ii. Chapter 51, *Contra Litteras Petiliani.*''

In his sixteenth epistle, he enumerates the Bishops of Rome from Peter to Anastasius.

Paul Orosius, a learned Priest of Tarragona, in Spain, who about the year 416, was in Palestine, and in several parts of the most flourishing divisions of the Church, the doctrine and knowledge of which he had fully known, testifies in Book vii. chapter 6 of his *History*:

''In the beginning of the reign of Claudius, Peter, the Apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ, came to Rome, and by faithful discourse taught the saving faith to all, and approved it by most powerful virtues, and from that time Christians began to be at Rome.'' . . . . . .

''For Nero first at Rome punished and slew Christians, and endeavouring to extirpate the very name, he put to death the most blessed Apostles of Christ, Peter by the cross, and Paul by the sword.''

Theodoret, Bishop of Cypress, was consecrated in 423; his see was about 80 miles from Antioch. He died in the year 458, before he had reached his 70th year. He was deeply versed in every branch of Syriac, Greek, and Hebrew learning, highly esteemed for his critical and philosophical powers. An unfortunate dispute existed between him and St. Cyril, of Alexandria, legate of Pope Celestine, regarding the personal criminality of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople; so that Theodoret was no flatterer of the See of Rome. He made a valuable compilation of Church history from the year 324, when Eusebius closed, to the year 429; besides writing several other works. In his *Commentary* on chapter i. to the Romans, we have this testimony:

''The great Peter first gave to them (the Romans) the gospel doctrine.''

In his *Epistle to Pope Leo the Great*, writing of Rome, he states:

''She possesses the sepulchres of our common fathers and doctors of the truth, of Peter and of Paul, which illuminate the souls of the faithful.'' . . . . . .

''They (Peter and Paul) have made your See the more illustrious; this is the sum of your goods. But God hath now also rendered their See bright and worthy of remark, when he has placed your holiness in that seat which emits the rays of the orthodox faith.''

I could swell this catalogue; but to what purpose? Nothing is more plainly exhibited upon the records of antiquity, in the writings of historians, in the letters of bishops, in the edicts of emperors, in the documents of churches, in public monuments, in the acts of councils, in the avowal of opponents, than that the blessed Apostle Peter was at Rome, was first Bishop of Rome, and died in that city, being bishop thereof. Let any man of common discernment now compare the small por-

tion of our evidence which I have adduced, with this miserable sophistry of the lauded Monsieur Blanc of Mens, Isere, and draw his own conclusion.

I have two other points to meet, which of course, I shall thoroughly discuss, viz., whether by Babylon, St. Peter meant Rome, or the city of Chaldea, or Grand Cairo; and also whether the Scripture does not contradict our position. But I was desirous of first giving a small specimen of our tradition, which is so much undervalued by those who have not had the opportunity of knowing the meaning which we attach to the word. With us tradition means conclusive evidence derived from the earliest ages. It might be of very little importance to the essayist, to his clerical brother, and to the *Christian Advocate*, to know what was the doctrine of the true believers of the early ages, the doctrine of those men who alone can be to us the witnesses of the authenticity and the integrity of the holy Scriptures; we pretend to no private inspiration to lead us individually to the knowledge of which book is, and which is not canonical; the canon by which the distinction was originally made, was found in the judgment and authority of those men who composed the Church of Christ in those primitive ages: the writers whom I have adduced as my witnesses are also the witnesses of their canons. Reject their testimony in one case, and how can you consistently retain it in another? Thus the holy trio destroy the holy Scriptures, and yet they make those Scriptures, which they so destroy, the foundation of their belief!!

The host of witnesses adduced by me might indeed have been interested in rendering credible the fact, that Peter was at Rome, and I am convinced they were, because they were so interested in rendering truth credible, and they proved their interest by their devotion thereto, exhibited in labours, in self-denial, by splendid virtue, in immense sacrifices, and frequently by martyrdom. But could they create monuments at Rome to commemorate facts which the Roman people knew to be fiction? Could they persuade the world that Peter, who must have died somewhere, and the place of whose death must have been known, did not die there, but died where he never had been, where no monument was found, no tradition existed, no claim was made? It would be folly in me to enumerate the absurdities which those suppositions would involve. But in calling forward a few from the host at my disposal, I have omitted several of the early Bishops of Rome itself: such as Clement and Anacletus in the first century, men who knew and spoke with Peter at Rome: Marcellus in the third century: Damasus and Innocent, who lived in the fourth: Leo the Great, and Gelasius, who are of the fifth century.

I have omitted the testimonies of Councils such as that of Sardica in 347, and of Chalcedon in 451. I have ceased to unfold the roll of ages, not because it was deficient in authorities, but because I am convinced that I have exhibited more than enough to satisfy any reasonable person.

If it be said that the Chrysostoms, the Ambroses, the Augustines, the Epiphaniuses, the Jeromes, the Eusebiuses, the Orosiuses, and the other luminaries of that splendid galaxy which marked the Christians' path from earth to heaven with the milk of celestial doctrine in the early days of the church, were interested in upholding the system today called Popery: they who make the assertion identify modern Popery, as they are pleased to call our religion, and the Christian system of the best, the brightest, and the earliest days of the church. How then, in the name of consistency, can we be charged with innovations, when we desire to be tried by the testimony of those ancient fathers? How can our separated brethren claim to hold the principles of the primitive church, when their continual efforts are directed to the destruction, or the depreciation of its splendid documents and noble witnesses?

Yours, respectfully, B. C.

LETTER V.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 1, 1828.

My Friends:—I proceed to examine the next paragraph of Monsieur Blanc's production.

"The tradition of this journey of St. Peter to Rome rests, moreover, upon the supposition that the Babylon from which he wrote his first epistle, was Rome. Eusebius strengthens this conjecture by saying that Peter, "figuratively called Rome, Babylon."[10] But many learned men with reason maintain that the name Babylon, ought to be taken in its proper signification, for Babylon of Chaldea, or that of Egypt, which is now Grand Cairo, where there were many Jews, to whom Peter was specially sent, as St. Paul teaches us, in the second chapter of his *Epistle to the Galatians*."

The second chapter of the *Epistle to the Galatians* states, indeed, a general regulation which was adopted for a division of labour, by which Peter was principally to labour amongst the Jews, and Paul principally amongst the Gentiles: but each of them did frequently labour amongst both descriptions. Peter first received Gentiles into the Church, (Acts x. 48,) and Paul frequently preached in the synagogues, and even in the city of Rome itself, he sought to bring

[10] Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 15.

the children of Israel to the knowledge of their Messias. If we look to the *Acts of the Apostles*, xiii. 14, we shall find abundant evidence of the fact, and verse 46 exhibits that it was not either unusual or accidental. "To you it behoved us to speak first the word of God: but seeing you reject it, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life; behold we turn to the Gentiles." The same principle is exhibited in *Acts* xvii. 1, 2, 10, 17; xviii. 4, 5, 19; xix. 8; xxviii. 17, 23, 28, and so forth, as also in many other passages: the fact of his addressing an epistle to the Hebrews, shows clearly that he found himself at perfect liberty to seek for their salvation, and to bring them into the Christian fold. Hence, upon the same ground, though the principal charge of labouring specially amongst the Jews was assumed by Peter, this selection did not interfere with his concern for the Gentiles. The chapter referred to by the essayist does not, therefore, preclude the labouring of Peter amongst the Gentiles.

I will now suppose that it was the duty of Peter to reside where a large body of Jews had been collected together. I shall adduce testimony to show that there was such an assemblage in Rome. In Josephus, (*Antiquit.* b. xvii., ch. xi., p. 62, vol. ii. of the Boston edit. of 1821,) we read that when the Jews sent fifty ambassadors to Rome for the purpose of lodging a complaint against the administration of Herod, in the reign of Augustus, there were "above eight thousand of the Jews already at Rome," joined in the commission with those fifty delegates from Palestine. The number of that nation residing in that city about the thirtieth year of the reign of Augustus, which corresponds with the beginning of the Christian era, has been estimated by good statistical antiquarians at considerably upwards of twelve thousand; several of whom would not join in the accusation against Herod, nor in petitioning for the restoration of the Jewish laws. During the forty-three years that intervened between this period and the arrival of Peter, the calamities and dissensions of Judea, as well as the tyranny of the petty rulers by whom it was harassed, caused the emigration of large bodies of its inhabitants, great numbers of whom took up their abode in the capital of the empire; so that in the reign of Caligula, Philo wrote that the larger portion of the city beyond the Tiber was occupied by Jews. Dio, the historian, Book 9, informs us, that in the reign of Claudius, who assumed the imperial purple in the year 41, and died in 54, that emperor found so many of this nation in Rome, that although desirous of banishing them, he feared to do so, and merely published, at first, an edict to prohibit their assemblage, lest they should create a sedition. Our statement is, that Peter arrived in this city in the beginning of the reign of Claudius,

probably about the middle or latter part of the year 43; and there can be no question, but that there was then an ample field amongst the Jews there open for his exertions: because probably, at that period, no other city in the universe contained so extensive an assemblage of that nation.

The preaching of this Apostle must have created considerable excitement amongst this people, as we may judge by analogy, from the relations given in the Acts of the Apostles. Hence, allowing for the carelessness and contempt with which a Gentile writer usually treated what was called the superstition of the Jews, we can easily find the true meaning of the blunder of Suetonius, (in Claudio,) *Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultantes, Roma expulit.* "He expelled from Rome the Jews, who were in a continual tumult at the instigation of Chrestus." The explanation is as obvious as it is correct. Though Christ was not there, his Apostle was; and this expulsion, which took place in the ninth year of Claudius, probably caused Peter, who was the leader of the Christians, to leave the city for some time. In examining the circumstances of Babylon and of Grand Cairo, I shall show that in neither place was there any such field open for the labours of this Apostle, as there was in Rome: so that it will be clear, the reference to the second chapter of the *Epistle to the Galatians* is a delusion. Even Monsieur Blanc does not venture to assert that when St. Peter wrote "the church which is in Babylon, elected together, saluteth you, and so doth my son Mark," he did not mean Rome, he merely tells us, that "many learned men with reason maintain that the name of Babylon ought to be taken in its proper signification, for Babylon of Chaldea, or that of Egypt, where were many Jews." It is, however, not a little remarkable that those "many learned men," who are all moderns, cannot inform us from which Babylon it was written, though they are certain that it was not written from Rome: neither do they vouchsafe to conjecture where St. Peter died, though they are convinced that it was not at Rome: nor will they show us where he laboured, though verily it could not be at Rome.

I shall now proceed to show sufficient grounds for substituting the word Babylon for Rome, in the epistle itself, by the writer. First, I have already shown that the Jews were banished from the city in the reign of Claudius, because of the tumults occasioned by the introduction of Christianity. They soon began to return, but slowly and privately at first; upon our statement St. Peter was the most obnoxious personage, as well to the great body of his own nation, as to the rulers of the city; upon which score prudence would suggest that he should not too openly and unecessarily exhibit to every person that he again resided in that

city; and could he find a word designating his abode, to those who would not betray him, and which would not point him out to his opponents, its use would be natural. Such a word was Babylon.

He wrote primarily to converted Hebrews, who had been accustomed to such figures of speech, and who were conversant with the writings of the prophets, in which they abounded. Amongst this people the name of a city, or of a region, had generally attached an historical recollection, which immediately exhibited what many phrases would be required to describe. Sodom was a city of unnatural crime, Egypt an idolatrous people, Canaan an accursed race, Babylon was the prison of their fathers, the enemy of their nation, the usurper of their rights, the tyrant of their race, the proud and inexorable mistress of their captive rulers. Such also in the days of Peter was pagan Rome; and the Asiatic Jews were so well accustomed to designate that mighty city by the name, that the Evangelist St. John so styles it, as in *Revelation* or *Apocalypse* xiv. 8; xvi. 19; xvii. 5; xviii. 2, 10, 21. To support the fact of their being so accustomed to style Rome, I could produce the testimony of Tertullian, Book 3, *contra Marcion*, Andreas and Arteas in *Apocalypse* xvii., St. Jerome in *Isaiam* xlvi., xlvii., and many others, who, together with Papias, Eusebius, and the several early writers, state that St. Peter meant Rome in this first epistle by the word Babylon. Not only has Martin Luther designated the city of Rome by this name, when he compiled his book *Of the Babylonish Captivity*, but hundreds of zealous Protestants perpetually apply to us Romanists, as they call us, all that is written against Babylon in the Revelations. It is to be hoped that the gentlemen do not mean to say and to unsay with the same breath. I will then conclude that Peter had a sufficient cause for styling Rome Babylon, and that in so doing he was intelligible to the persons for whom he wrote.

I might here rest my case, and upon the testimonies of the ancient witnesses assert, that we have in this epistle the declaration of Peter himself, that he was at Rome. Let those who assert that he was the founder of the church in Babylon of Chaldea, or of that in Grand Cairo, adduce their authorities: let them produce the records of those churches; let them give to us the catalogue of his successors; let them inform us of the place, the time, the manner of his death; let them refer us to one ancient writer who gives the shadow of a contradiction to our statement, or who affords even the most flimsy basis upon which to rest their conjectures.

I go yet farther, and I ask as if was not written from the Babylon of the Apocalypse, which is Rome, from what Babylon was it written?

The answer which I receive is a conjecture. I have produced positive testimony. What species of logic is that, which would destroy positive testimony by the conjecture of a possibility? But I yield all this, and proceed to examine the conjectures themselves. In truth the advocates of each will refute the advocates of the other. Those who contend that the epistle was written from Chaldea, state that in the second, which was written from the same place, (ch. ii., v. 15,) the word *Bosor* is a Chaldaic expression, and that this furnishes evidence sufficient for the residence of the writer. I have but a very passing remark to make upon this extraordinary obstacle. A transcriber might have written *Bosor* for *Beor*, by mistake, and the word would then cease to be Chaldaic. Again, between the period when Moses wrote that Balaam was the son of *Beor*, and the period of Peter's writing his epistles, the Hebrew people had been captives in Chaldea; and, long before the Apostle's day, the Syro-Chaldaic had been substituted for the ancient Hebrew. Several pure Chaldaic words were also adopted, of which *Bosor* might have been one.

The ground next taken by those persons is, that although the Jews of Babylon had been greatly reduced in number by the destructive ravages made upon them under Anileus and Asineus, as well by the Babylonians as by the united Greeks and Syrians, still there were many of them who survived and settled in Chaldea, as the last chapter of Josephus, Book xviii. exhibits. They also state there are no grounds whatever for the supposition of those who assert that Peter went into Egypt and there founded a church at Babylon, now called Grand Cairo; but they think it extremely probable that he who preached in Bithynia, Galatia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, did go to Babylon of Chaldea, which was in his vicinity, and came through it to Syria. They say it is on all hands allowed that he was at Antioch, and it is natural to suppose that he went thence to Babylon of Chaldea, where a great number of Jews dwelt, and remained with them for some time.

My readers will observe that all this is merely conjecture and probability, save the assertion that no evidence exists of his having founded a church in Egypt.

Now, the good gentlemen of the other side assure us, that Babylon of Egypt must have been the city of his sojourn; for they demonstrate that, at this period, the Jews were banished from the Chaldean city, which had also become nearly a desert,—and that St. Peter, having preached in Egypt, of which, by the by, they bring no proof, and having established the See of Alexandria, of which they give no proof, went to the city of Babylon, now called Grand Cairo, and there established his

own see. Thus, if we leave the fight between our adversaries, they will destroy each other.

I shall give an outline of the reasoning upon which we allege that this epistle was not written from Babylon in Chaldea. In the first place, we have no testimony to uphold the assertion that Peter ever went to that city,—and we have abundant evidence that he did go to Rome, which was known amongst the Jews and the early Christians under the name of Babylon, because of the criminality of its pagan inhabitants, their pride, their lust of dominion, their oppression of the people of God, and their accumulated idolatry. Next, we have the testimony of Pliny to show that the city of Chaldea was then in a state verging upon ruin, and hastening to decay: that author, Book vii. chapter 26, writes, that at this period it was reduced to a state of solitude, exhausted by the vicinity of Seleucia, upon the Tigris, which had been built as its destructive rival by Nicanor. Strabo informs us, that it was then comparatively a desert,—and Diodorus states that but a very small portion of the remains of that city was inhabited.

Add to these testimonies that of Josephus, who informs us in the chapter before cited, that, after the death of Anileus and his companions, which occurred before the reign of Claudius, when this epistle was written, the Jews who remained in Babylon, not finding themselves sufficiently strong to resist the other inhabitants, most of them left the place, and took up their abode in Seleucia. Six years after that migration, a plague, which ravaged this devoted Babylon, swept away the remnant which lingered amidst its ruins. Nor were those who took refuge in Seleucia much more fortunate; for the Greeks and Syrians of that city having conspired, suddenly attacked their Jewish fellow-citizens, of whom they massacred upwards of 50,000: the few survivors then of this nation that yet wept upon the borders of the Euphrates or the Tigris, were sheltered in Neerda and in Nisibi. Are we then, because the word Bosor is Chaldaic, and because the right of Roman primacy rests upon the fact of Peter's having been at Rome, to declare, that because there were Jews in Babylon before the period of their flight and extermination, this apostle, as being chiefly anxious for their conversion, went to dwell in a city where scarcely one of that nation had remained?

Surely, my friends, though that destruction should not even have taken place previously to the writing of this epistle,—and though we should not have good reason to know that St. Peter and his brethren were guided by the prophetic spirit to which futurity is open, still we must acknowledge that he and they received from on high, light to understand the scriptural prophecies; and he needed only to look through

the *Book of Isaias* to be convinced that "Babylon, the oppressor, should come to nothing," xvi. 4. "Its pride should be brought down to hell," verse 11. "Its name was to be destroyed, the remains, the bud, and the offspring," verse 22. "It was to be made a possession for the ericus and pools of waters—it was to be swept and worn out with a besom," verse 23. "It was to be destroyed like Sodom and Gomorrah," xiii. verse 19. "It should not be inhabited for ever, neither should the Arabian pitch his tent there, nor shepherds rest there," verse 20. "But wild beasts should rest there, the houses should be filled with serpents, ostriches should dwell there, and the hairy ones should dance there," verse 21. "Owls should answer one another in it," verse 22. And yet, with this prophecy under his eye, and the proof of its beginning to be accomplished in full evidence before him, the holy trio would, against his own judgment, and the evidence of all antiquity, send Peter to Chaldea, that they might keep him out of Italy! Admirable critics! Profound antiquarians! Learned commentators! If farther evidence was required of the prophecies, it might be easily found in chapter xxi. of the same prophet, in *Jeremias*, chapter l. li., and in several other places. From these topics, I conclude that Peter could not have written from Babylon in Chaldea, for his residence in which we have not a particle existing there in his day, nor any likelihood of his going thither.

Mr. Blanc states, that in the Egyptian Babylon there "were many Jews to whom Peter was specially sent." If by "many Jews," he means such a number as a few thousands, the information is quite new to me. This city was called Bubasticus, in the Nomos Heliopolitis, and is now probably the city of Grand Cairo. It was built by a Persian colony after the subjugation of Egypt by Cambyses, about 500 years before the period of Peter's writing. In the time of Strabo, which was a little previous to the days of this Apostle, it was considered chiefly as a strong citadel, which formed a good garrison for one of the Roman legions then sent to guard Egypt (*Strabo.* lib. xvii.); but we are left without any information of its being a place in which either Jews or Christians dwelt in any numbers during more than four centuries later than this period: indeed, the Jews of Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and generally of Asia Minor, knew very little, if anything, of this distant city of Egypt. According to this view, which is the best that we can give of the Egyptian Babylon, there appears nothing to support the assertion of the essayist, that in this city there "were many Jews to whom Peter was specially sent." Thus, without evidence of the fact, without any probable grounds even for conjecture, merely because of the name of Babylon, and the dislike to Rome, we are to cast away the

testimony of the ancient witnesses, and to place the Apostle in Grand Cairo!!

It is natural to presume that, if he had been there, a Christian church would have existed in this city, yet of this we have no evidence; even Spanheim, a learned Protestant divine, with all his research, could not discover an earlier bishop of Grand Cairo than Cyrus, whose name is mentioned in the first proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon, in 451. Baronius, however, will have it that Zosimus, who lived under the Emperor Justin the younger, about a century later than that period, is the first. I shall grant Spanheim the benefit of his discovery, and how far will it bring his party on their way? To this I shall add a remark of Calmet, which has great force. Suppose Rome to be out of the question, and the word Babylon written as the place of the writer's abode,—would not those persons who lived in the vicinity of this ancient metropolis, and who scarcely knew of the Egyptian city, naturally look to the Chaldean, unless some guarded phrase or well-known circumstance corrected their mistake? Yet here is no such phrase, and if any such circumstance existed, it must be known to the early writers, some one of whom would have thrown some light upon the subject, and prevented the supposed delusion under which all Christians laboured during so many centuries, in believing the Babylon of St. Peter to be the Babylon of St. John. These few testimonies and observations will show why I state that Peter, by writing from Babylon, informs us that he writes from Rome, and not from a city on the Euphrates, the Tigris, or the Nile. Upon these grounds, I assert that in the Scripture itself, and under Peter's own hand, we have evidence of his having been in Rome.

I shall here introduce the testimony of the learned Hugo Grotius, who, though not within the pale of our communion, gave strong evidence in our favour on more subjects than the present. In his remarks upon this epistle he states.

De Babylonia dissident veteres et novi interpretes. Veteres Romam interpretantur, ubi Petrum fuisse nemo verus Christianus dubitabit. Novi, Babylonem in Chaldea; Ego veteribus assentior.

"The ancient and the modern interpreters differ concerning Babylon. The ancients interpret it to be Rome, where no true Christian will doubt that Peter was. The moderns, Babylon in Chaldea; I agree with the ancients."

Some few gentlemen not being able to get over the difficulties of Babylon upon the Euphrates, nor of Babylon upon the Nile, have recollected that Seleucia was also called by this ominous name, but I suspect that Seleucia might have been considered as altogether placed beyond our question after the massacre of 50,000 Jews and the flight of the remainder to Neerda and to Nisibi. But a French Protestant divine,

Louis Capelle, who died in 1658, not satisfied with either of the above conjectures, and of all things disliking to go to Rome, fixed upon Jerusalem as the Babylon of Peter, because there Christ was slain, and the Apostles persecuted. My object, however, being only to discharge the task which I have undertaken, that is, to examine Mr. Blanc's dissertation, I shall not go out of it into extraneous topics, to quarrel with Mr. Capelle.

I have thus shown that there is no ground for interpreting the word Babylon, in this place, otherwise than all antiquity has done, and therefore, we do follow "the tradition" that the first epistle of Peter was written at Rome.

I remain, my friends,
Yours, and so forth. B. C.

LETTER VI.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 9, 1828.

My Friends:—I now proceed to examine the question, whether the Scripture as quoted by Monsieur Blanc, contradicts our statement, which consists of three distinct propositions, viz. 1. That St. Peter the Apostle was at Rome. 2. That he was bishop of that city; and 3. That he, being its bishop, suffered martyrdom there.

This writer does not adduce any distinct passage of the Scripture which denies, or is incompatible with either, or the whole of our three propositions: but he assumes, by a chronological arrangement which is unwarranted, that some scriptural statements, whose truth we admit, are irreconcilable with the truth of our positions. It would, therefore, be well for us to have accurate notions of what we assert, so that we may be able to distinguish what we require and support, from what it is assumed we contend for. In the first place, though I believe that St. Peter went to Rome in the first or second year of the reign of the Emperor Claudius, if not in the last year of Caligula: it will be sufficient for my purpose if I prove that he was there only twenty-one or twenty-four years after, viz., in the latter part of the reign of Nero: for if he was then put to death, being Bishop of Rome, our three propositions will stand, and his office was to be continued in that city, unless, what is not pretended, he transferred it elsewhere. What says Mr. Blanc?

"The best Catholic ecclesiastical writers put the martyrdom of Stephen in the seventh year after the death of Jesus Christ; in other words, A. D. 40. The conversion of St. Paul, at soonest, happened this year. Thus we see seven years already past.

At this epoch, St. Peter was still at Jerusalem with the other Apostles; and not until some time afterwards, he was sent with St. John to strengthen the Samaritans, who had been converted by the ministry of St. Philip. 'Now when the Apostles who were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John,' (*Acts* viii. 14). At this epoch, Peter was still under the authority of the apostolical college; it was only five or six hundred years afterwards, that he seized upon the sovereign power, in the person of his successors. After the conversion of St. Paul, we find St. Peter at Lydda, where he cured Eneas, (*Acts* ix. 32-34), at Joppe, where he raised Dorcas from the dead (ix. 36-41); at Cesarea, where he converted Cornelius, (x.) Upon the report spreading that Peter had eaten with the Gentiles, he returns to Jerusalem, and vindicates himself before 'them that were of the circumcision,' (xi.) This journey of Peter, his preaching in the provinces of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, his abode at Joppa, and the other events which St. Luke relates, occupy a space of three years (A. D. 43). We learn that the Christians dispersed on occasion of the death of Stephen, had carried the good savour of the gospel to Antioch. Thither Barnabas was immediately sent, who seeing the grace of God, departed to Tarsus, to seek Paul (*Acts* xi. 25), and bring him to Antioch, where they remained 'a whole year,' (xi. 26, A. D. 44). About this time the famine predicted by Agabus should be placed, the martyrdom of St. James, the imprisonment of St. Peter, and his remarkable deliverance, (*Acts* xii). Thus far St. Peter is constantly found in Judea, not manifesting upon any occasion the desire of going to Rome: and why should he have gone thither, since that city fell not within his charge? St. Paul says positively, 'The gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; for he that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me towards the Gentiles—James, Cephas, and John, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.' (*Gal.* ii. 7-9). St. Paul, three years after his conversion, going up to Jerusalem to carry the alms of the Christians of Antioch and the circumjacent places, met Peter there, with whom he remained fifteen days. (*Acts* xi. 30; *Gal.* i. 18). He went up thither a second time, fourteen years afterwards, (*Gal.* ii. 1), and there he still met with Peter and his principal colleagues, (v. 9, A. D. 58). Behold, then, Peter constantly at Jerusalem, seven years—ten years—twenty-five years, after the death of Jesus Christ. If we read with a little attention the eleventh verse of this second chapter of the *Epistle to the Galatians*, it appears that it was not till after this time that St. Peter went to Antioch, where, it is pretended, this Apostle occupied the episcopal chair for seven years; which would be still so many to be deducted from his pretended residence at Rome.''

It is perhaps cruel to take this little scrap of chronology to pieces, but so it is, that my conviction imposes upon me the task. Now it is very well ascertained that in the various systems of calculation, there exists a difference of from four to five years between the computation of our era and the true period of the birth of our Redeemer. For this a very sufficient cause is obvious: the computation by the Christian era was not immediately commenced; indeed it was only in 527 of our common era, which was the last year of the eastern Emperor Justin I., that Dionysius Exiguus, a learned Scythian, who was an abbot in Rome, published a pas-

chal cycle, in which he began his computations by taking the first of January next after the birth of our Saviour, for the commencement of his first year: the venerable Bede, who compiled a learned work, *De Temporum ratione*, in 731, uses a different computation; for he begins his reckoning, which was continued by several until lately, from the 25th of March previous to the birth of Christ, that is, the day of the annunciation, so, that what he would call the first of April, 732, would by Dionysius be called 731. Some moderns have yet more perplexed the subject, by speculations which they miscall "historical philosophy." We have, however, two excellent checks in the list of consuls, and in the testimony of the early Christian fathers. By accurately examining we find, that by the computation upon those principles, our present era is, as has long been acknowledged, upwards of four years too late. According to the computation of Varro, Christ was born in the consulship of Augustus (12,) and L. Corn. Sulla, or the fortieth of the reign of Augustus, A. U. C. 749: he was baptized in his thirtieth year, and was crucified on the 25th of March, in the thirty-third year of his age, of the common æra 29, in the consulship of the two Gemini. Amongst other authorities for this are Tertullian, *adv. Jud.* chapter 8; St. Augustin, Book xviii. chapter 54, *De civitate Dei*; Victor Aquitanus; the Liberian calendar, and so forth: this was in the year 15 of Tiberius reigning alone; which statement is also supported by Lactantius, Book iv. chapter 10, St. Prosper, and so forth. Having thus regulated the mode of computing by the vulgar era, I have to state that, as the erudite gentleman has not vouchsafed to give us the names of "the best Catholic writers."[11] How fond he is of turning our forces against ourselves! "Who place the martyrdom of St. Stephen in the year 40." I must adhere to those whom I have read, and place it in the same year that our Saviour was crucified. In doing this, I shall be supported, amongst others, by the learned Protestant Scaliger, and by Valesius in his notes upon the historian Eusebius, Book ii. chapter 1. I shall also be upheld by Albam Butler, who upon such a subject is no mean authority. Thus in the first four lines of this paragraph, I gain eleven years upon this most learned Theban: so that even if the rest of his paragraph were correct, he ought to write A. D. 47, in place of 58. How wretched a contrivance is the attempt to

[11] This sentence is evidently incomplete. The mistake seems to be the printer's. The following correction presents the sentence as, very probably, it stood in the MSS. of Bishop England: "Having thus regulated the mode of computing the vulgar era, I have to state that, as the erudite gentleman has not vouchsafed to give us the names of the best Catholic writer"—(How fond he is of turning our forces against ourselves) —who place the martyrdom of St. Stephen in the year 40, I must adhere to those whom I have read, and place it in the same year that our Saviour was crucified.—ED.

introduce a new question as decided, in *Acts* viii. 14, "Peter still under the authority of the apostolical college," when the question under examination is merely as to his residence and death at Rome? With this alleged authority I have at present no concern.

A great variety of other dates are to be settled here in a very different way from that in which Monsieur Blanc touches them off. All the ancient writers agree that after the death of Stephen, that is in the course of the year 30, the Apostles went round to the vicinity of Judea, but did not disperse into other nations until the twelfth year from our Saviour's death. In the fifth of those years, Peter fixed his See at Antioch: this would leave him more than the three years, claimed by the essayist, for the occurrences related in *Acts* viii., ix., x. and xi. When an Apostle fixed his See in any particular city, it by no means follows as a necessary consequence that he never visited any other: a Bishop's See is the principal place where he usually resides, but he is frequently absent on visitations, at councils, and on a variety of other occasions: so that the fixing of his See at Antioch is by no means a reason for assuming that the Apostle was never absent from that city. The statement of St. Paul's visit to Peter at Jerusalem, according to Mr. Blanc, will not interfere with this supposition: my object at present being, first, to take the essayist's own order of facts, which order, however, the sacred volume does not determine. I shall use the liberty which he gives me of placing the conversion of Paul in the year after the death of Stephen, or the second year after, if it pleases him better. St. Paul states, that "three years after this," not his conversion, but his return to Damascus, he went to Jerusalem and stayed fifteen days with Peter, (*Galat.* i. 18). Now according to Mr. Blanc this might well have occurred previous to Peter's fixing his See at Antioch, or if we state this visit to have been in the year 37, as it is made by some who say that St. Paul did not return to Damascus until 33, Peter, though Bishop of Antioch, might have been on a visit in Jerusalem.

Mr. Blanc, however, has to account in this place for a contradiction of his own to St. Paul, who, in *Galatians* i., informing us of his first visit to Jerusalem, states the object of his journey was "to see Peter," and this previously to his having been called by Barnabas to Antioch: yet Mr. Blanc tells us, that this is the same visit of which mention is made in *Acts* xi. 30, whereas the whole body of ancient witnesses as well as St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, testify that they were different visits. Paul's object in his Epistle to the Galatians was not to state all the visits which he had paid to Jerusalem, but to state those by occasion of which he met any of the other Apostles in that city: and

as the object of his first journey was to carry alms: we are not then to confound both journeys as the essayist does, but to distinguish them, as the ancients and the Scriptures have done.

But why, if his object was truth, does the writer pass over chapter ix. of the *Acts,* in which mention is made of this first visit? why does he at once bring us to chapter xi. where the second visit is related? In his Epistle to the Galatians Paul states that after his conversion he went into Arabia, and returned to Damascus, three years after which he went up to "see Peter," who was in Jerusalem. In *Acts* ix. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, we are told by St. Luke how he went from Damascus to Jerusalem. In this same place we are informed of the manner in which he was sent from that city to Cæsarea and Tarsus; there he is left, until we find in *Acts* xi. 25, that he is brought to Antioch, and then in verse 30, he makes another journey from Antioch to Jerusalem.

But the good gentleman has so prettily attempted to interweave facts separated by years, and to transpose their order, that I must here stop to replace them. The first visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem was fourteen years previous to his second meeting of Peter in that city. (*Gal.* ii. 1). St. Paul was not at Antioch before his calling on Peter in the third or fourth year after his return to Damascus; neither did he go from Jerusalem to Antioch at this time, but was brought by the disciples into regions which he mentions in *Galatians* i. 21, Cilicia and Syria: having tarried in those regions during three or four years, and his aid being called for in Antioch subsequently to the dispersion of the other Apostles and the departure of Peter from that city, he in in the beginning of the reign of Claudius accompanied Barnabas thither; because of the necessities of that church, arising from the large number of converts, (*Acts* xi. 25, 26, and so forth.) The time is here marked by the sacred writer in verses 27 and 28. Claudius began his reign as we see in 41. There is nothing in the Bible to prevent our asserting that at this same period Peter was cast into prison in Jerusalem and miraculously delivered, as related in Acts xii., previously to his going to Rome; and that he occasionally visited the East so as to have met St. Paul again in Jerusalem in 51. However, I shall instead of those surmises lay down what appears to be the general testimony of all the ancient writers, viz. That Peter founded the See of Antioch in the year 33, and occasionally visited Jerusalem and the neighbouring regions: that in 37, when he was at Jerusalem, he was visited by Paul, who went thence to Cilicia and its vicinity, and that Peter having gone to Rome in 40, Paul was about 41 or 42 brought by Barnabas to labour for a time in Antioch; that Peter, having returned to visit the East, was cast

into prison by Herod in Jerusalem in 44, and escaped as related in *Acts* xii., and going back to Rome, remained until the expulsion under Claudius in 49; when, returning a second time to the East, he was at Jerusalem at the council in 51 (*Acts* xv), where Paul met him the second time, fourteen years after their first interview. But in the mean time whilst Peter was absent on his second visit to the West, in the end of 44 or 45, Paul had been to Jerusalem with the alms from Antioch and other places, (*Acts* xi. 30).

I am here obliged to notice another instance in which the essayist asserts incompatibilities. He states that Barnabas was sent to Antioch immediately after the dispersion of the Christians, upon the death of Stephen. I shall merely remark that St. Luke's object in this chapter evidently is to follow up the account which he had given in chap. x and the first part of chap. xi., of the admission of Gentiles into the church. Hence he treats the subject historically and apart, without interweaving it with the other occurrences. A single observation will show this to be a correct statement. The conversion of St. Paul did not occur until after the increase of the Christians, by reason of their first dispersion upon the death of Stephen. (*Acts* viii. 1 to 5). Now between the statement in this passage and its repetition, so far as regarded a particular place, viz., Antioch, in *Acts* xi. 19, a great many occurrences, which occupied several years, are summarily related without mentioning the exact order of their dates: it was not until some years after the death of Stephen, that Cornelius was received into the church, as related in *Acts* x.; Peter's explanation followed this occurrence, and then the sacred historian, having mentioned this account and decision of Peter, reverts to the former period of several years previous, for the purpose of showing how the church of Antioch had a great number of converts, and to continue therein the history of St. Paul, which occupies the chief share of his attention thenceforth. Hence it would be absurd to state that the occurrence related in the 19th verse immediately followed that whose relation had been closed in the 18th: and it is equally clear that the transactions related in verses 19, 20, 21 and 22, took up several years. In verse 19 it is plain that the first disciples preached only to the Jews at Antioch. It is as clear from chapter xi. 1, 2, 3, that the Apostles and brethren who were in Judea, did not look upon themselves as authorized to receive the Gentiles into the church until after they had received the explanation of St. Peter; and it is only in verse 18 we find their first recognition of the principle that they might be received: they could not, therefore, have previously sent Barnabas to Antioch, and this recognition having been some years after the death of Stephen, they

could not have sent Barnabas thither immediately after his death, as Mr. Blanc says they did. But suppose this difficulty now removed, still Barnabas could not have found Saul in Tarsus, until after his conversion, his return from Arabia to Damascus, his journey three years afterwards to Jerusalem, and his going thence to Cæsarea and Tarsus, in which place he tarried for some considerable time. So that if Paul came to Antioch in 44, as we believe he did, and soon after the arrival of Barnabas, as was the fact, this latter could not have gone thither before 42 or 43, at which period Peter, having left Antioch, was in Rome, or on his way thence, back to Asia. We shall also find time for him previously to have spent three years in his visits through the regions mentioned in *Acts* viii., ix. x., and xi., besides seven years being permitted to elapse from his having fixed his See in Antioch, until his departure for Rome; and we can easily conceive that within those seven years he might frequently have visited Jerusalem, on one of which occasions St. Paul paid him a visit of fifteen days, in the year 37. Mr. Blanc then, besides suppressing the reference to this visit, which is related in *Acts* ix., endeavours to confound it with that mentioned in *Acts* xi., and makes the statement in *Galatians* i., refer to the latter, when in fact it refers to the former; thus endeavouring to destroy the evidence of one of those journeys. He next, against all the ancient witnesses, defers the martyrdom of Stephen full seven years, and omits to correct the calculation of the era by upwards of four years, so as to throw twelve years out of the account: then to give a colour of truth to his statements, he makes the Apostles send Barnabas to Antioch immediately after the death of Stephen, when it is evident that such could not have been their procedure for several years thereafter, and he makes Barnabas bring Paul from Tarsus within a year or two after the death of the first deacon, when it is manifest, from the accounts of Paul himself and of Luke, that this could not have occurred at the soonest before the lapse of from eight to twelve or thirteen years from that period. Again, the essayist assumes that because Peter was twice met at Jerusalem by Paul, he could not in the fourteen years which elapsed between those interviews have been at Antioch and at Rome.

You will then, my friends, perceive that our distribution of Peter's time creates no difficulty in explaining all the passages of St. Luke, whilst it also agrees with all the accounts of the ancient writers; whereas Mr. Blanc's mode of mixing up and confounding dates and facts makes the Scripture contradict itself, and it also contradicts all the ancient witnesses.

Why Peter should go to Rome, even for the sake of the Jews, if

for no other cause, I have already shown. That he went to Antioch after the Council of Jerusalem, which was held in 51, that is, fourteen years after 37, we also freely admit, and that for his imprudence he was admonished by St. Paul, I also believe, though several good critics are of opinion that the Cephas mentioned in *Galatians* ii. 14, and who was reproved, was not St. Peter, but another disciple. My own opinion, however, is in unison with that of the great body of commentators, that it was St. Peter the Apostle who was so admonished, though in verse 8, speaking of the Apostle, the writer calls him Peter, and in the next verse he mentions James, Cephas, and John, whereas it is not an unusual mode thus to write of the same person, almost in the same line, by two different names. However, suppose it be Peter; his being now at Antioch does not argue that he had not been previously there, and also at Rome: so that hitherto, as you will have perceived, my friends, the difficulties and contradictions are on the side of our opponents; and I shall have to reduce his A. D. 58 to A. D. 51.

"But this is not all. St. Paul wrote to the Romans in the year 57 or 58, about 25 years after the death of Jesus Christ; at this very time St. Peter ought to have been at Rome, or never. Meanwhile St. Paul glories in being especially their apostle: 'I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office.' If St. Peter had been settled and acknowledged as their proper apostle or bishop for several years past, would it not have been great arrogance in Paul to deprive him, after some sort, of his title and character? Above all, would it not have been great injustice to say, 'From Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation?' (*Rom.* xv. 19, 20). How then should he think of going to Rome, if St. Peter had already built there the first church of the world?"

What I have stated in my last letter answers this.

"Why, in the long detail of salutations, which fill almost the whole of the last chapter of this epistle, is there no mention made of the great head of the universal church? In A. D. 60, when Paul arrived at Rome, he called together the principal Jews that were in the city, (*Acts* xxviii. 17), without supposing himself to usurp the rights and the authority of the prince of the Apostles, without even thinking of St. Peter, who beyond controversy would have been of the greatest utility to him in his bonds, (A. D. 62). St. Paul remained two whole years in Rome, (*Acts* xxviii. 30); he wrote from thence divers letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and the Philippians; all these letters close with the salutations of the principal Christians of that famous city, and nowhere do we find a single word of St. Peter. How shall this silence be accounted for (consistently with Peter's supposed presence at Rome)? Truly, I should be curious to know. 'Aristarchus,' (it is said in the *Epistle to Colossians,* ch. iv. 10, 11), 'my fellow-prisoner—and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabus—and Jesus, who is called Justus, who are of the circumcision: these only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, who have been a comfort to me.' Mark well the words 'these only.' How injurious to St. Peter, if he had been at Rome!"

To this mighty query a short reply will be sufficient. 1. That St. Peter, being frequently absent from the city of Rome, might to the knowledge of Paul himself, have been elsewhere at the very time that he wrote his epistle; or that Phebe, who perhaps was the bearer of the letter to the Romans, was to deliver it to Peter, if in the city, and he was to make the salutations. The omission of the name of Peter is therefore no evidence that this was not his see: the same might be said of the omission of the names of other known prelates in other epistles. 2. That although the ordinary successors of Peter were to enter upon his full rights as head of the church, the extraordinary mission which each Apostle had specially and immediately from Christ was not under Peter's control, but the extraordinary commission of each Apostle was to expire with himself, and the surviving pastors were to be subordinate to the successor of Peter: such is the testimony of antiquity, and this supported by the testimony of facts, in those early days; hence there was no necessity for any one of the Apostles to apply to his brother for a power which they both possessed in common, viz., that of preaching and administering by the commission of Jesus Christ to the whole world. 3. The Jews whom St. Paul called to him at Rome were those who did not belong to the church, but who were in communion with those who opposed Paul himself in the East; and a very sufficient reason is found for his not calling upon Peter, either in the fact of his absence from the city, for he spread the faith in several other parts of Italy, and in other regions farther west,—or if he was in the city, in the fact of his being most obnoxious to the unconverted Jews, who, and whose fathers had been banished, because of the tumults caused by his former preaching, about eleven years before. This will also account for the mighty word only, without being an imputation upon the zeal of Peter.

One objection only remains.

"Arrived, for the second time, at Rome, A. D. 65 or 66, and the 10th or 11th of the reign of Nero. He was then put in so close a prison that Onesiphorus could scarcely find him, (*II Tim.* i. 17), and the persecution was so great, that he wrote to his dearly beloved pupil, Timothy, (*II Tim.* iv. 16), that 'no man stood with him, but all men forsook him.' Would not this have been a fine eulogy on St. Peter, if he had been at Rome? Let us farther observe, that this Apostle, to whom was committed the circumcision, as we have remarked above, never wrote an epistle to the Romans; that he never speaks of them in the two letters, which we have from him; and that, in writing the second, to the same churches to which he had written the first (*II Pet.* iii. 1), he speaks to them as aware that he would shortly quit this earthly tabernacle. (*II Pet.* i. 14). Let us finally remark, that St. Peter, although near his departure from this world, salutes the faithful only on the part of Marcus his son (*I Pet.* v. 13), without speaking of St. Paul, whose companion in martyrdom some would have him to be."

St. Peter's eulogy is found in his imprisonment; and if neither Paul nor any person save Mark could approach him, it accounts for the omission of all other names, if indeed it is necessary to account for the omission. Monsieur Blanc, who ridicules the notion of Nero's permitting St. Peter to request that his crucifixion might take place with his head downwards, would indeed have room for his jocularity, were we to state that he permitted him and Paul, upon the eve of their martyrdom, to consult together upon the form of an exhortation to perseverance, to a people whom he had doomed to extermination!!

I have done with Mr. Blanc. Allow me to sum up my statements. I have shown that there is nothing in the Scripture to interfere with the testimony of Peter's having been Bishop of Rome, and suffering martyrdom in that city. I have shown that a host of ancient testimony and modern criticism of the opponents, as well as the friends of the Bishops of Rome sustain the facts; I have shown that if we reject this testimony we must reject the Bible, because we receive the sacred volume only through similar, I might say, the same witnesses. I have shown that Mr. Blanc's theory, besides contradicting St. Paul and St. Luke, contradicts itself, whilst our statement is free from any such difficulty. I have shown numerous and important assertions of his to be contrary to the fact. I shall now, without having exhausted half my stock of testimony, close with an extract from a work [12] compiled by English Protestants.

"After this journey to Antioch, we are nowhere furnished with any very distinct account of Peter's travels. Eusebius informs us, that Origen, in the third tome of his *Exposition on Genesis*, wrote to this purpose: 'Peter is supposed to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia; who, at length coming to Rome, was crucified with his head downwards, himself having desired it might be in that manner.' Some learned men think, that in the latter part of his life he went into Chaldea, and there wrote his first Epistle, because the salutation of the church at Babylon is sent in it; and their opinion, though not supported by the testimony of ancient writers, is not devoid of probability. The books of the New Testament, indeed, afford no light for determining where he was for several years, after receiving the reproof of St. Paul, already mentioned. The learned, therefore, have been obliged to content themselves with conjectures on this subject. Among the various hypotheses, not one appears to us to be upon the whole more reasonable, or less open to objections, than that of the able and dispassionate Lardner. 'It appears to me not unlikely,' says he, 'that Peter returned in a short time to Judea from Antioch; and that he staid in Judea a good while, before he went thence any more; and it seems to me, that when he left Judea, he went again to Antioch, the chief city in Syria. Thence he might go into other parts of the continent, particularly Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, which are expressly mentioned in the beginning of his first Epistle. In those countries he might stay a good while. It is very likely that he did so, and that he was well

[12] From Aikin's *General Biography*, London, 1813.

acquainted with the Christians there, to whom he afterwards wrote two Epistles. When he left those parts, I think he went to Rome: but not till after Paul had been in that city, and was gone from it. Several of St. Paul's Epistles furnish out a cogent argument of Peter's absence from Rome, for a considerable space of time. St. Paul, in the last chapter of his *Epistle to the Romans*, written, as we suppose, in the beginning of the year 58, salutes many by name, without mentioning Peter. And the whole tenor of the Epistle makes it reasonable to think, that the Christians there had not yet the benefit of that Apostle's presence and instructions. During his two years' confinement at Rome, which ended, as we suppose, in the spring of the year 63, St. Paul wrote four or five Epistles—those to the Ephesians, the second Epistle to Timothy, to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon: in none of which is any mention of Peter; nor is anything said or hinted, whence it can be concluded that he had ever been there. I think, therefore, that Peter did not come to Rome before the year 63, or perhaps 64; and, as I suppose, he obtained the crown of martyrdom in the year 64 or 65; consequently St. Peter could not reside very long at Rome before his death.'

"Jerome, in his book *De Vir. Illust.* chapter 1., says, that Peter was bishop of Rome during five-and-twenty years; but such a statement is totally irreconcilable with the history in the Acts of the Apostles. On the other hand, several learned men, particularly Scaliger, Salmasius, Frederick Spanheim, and others, have denied that Peter was at Rome. But their opinion is satisfactorily opposed by a great majority of critics, Protestants as well as Catholics. In Lardner, as referred to below, the reader may meet with a concentrated view of the evidence from antiquity, on which Peter's having been at Rome rests, which is thus concluded by that writer: 'It is easy to observe, that it is the general, uncontradicted, disinterested testimony of ancient writers, in the several parts of the world, Greeks, Latins, Syrians. As our Lord's prediction concerning the death of Peter is recorded in one of the four Gospels, it is very likely that Christians would observe the accomplishment of it, which must have been in some place; and about this place, there is no difference among Christian writers of ancient times. Never any other place was named beside Rome; nor did any other city ever glory in the martyrdom of Peter. There were, in the second and third centuries, disputes between the Bishop of Rome and other bishops and churches, about the time of keeping Easter, and about the baptism of heretics: yet none denied the Bishop of Rome to have what they called the chair of Peter. It is not for our honour, nor for our interest, either as Christians or Protestants, to deny the truth of events, ascertained by early and well-attested tradition. If any make an ill use of such facts, we are not accountable for it. We are not, from a dread of such abuses, to overthrow the credit of all history; the consequence of which would be fatal. Fables and fictions have been mixed with the accounts of Peter's being at Rome; but they are not in the most early writers; they have been added since. And it is well known that fictions have been joined with histories of the most certain and important facts.' In our Life of St. Paul, we have already shown it to be most probable, that he and St. Peter were both put to death at Rome, in the year 64 or 65. With respect to what is said in the passage cited from Eusebius, concerning Peter's desire that he might be crucified with his head downwards, as the circumstance is not noticed by some ancient writers who speak of his martyrdom, its accuracy has been questioned. There is no doubt but that, among the Romans, some were so crucified, to add to their pain and ignominy; and Lardner admits that Peter might be crucified in that manner, and that it might be owing to the spite and

malice of those who put him to death. He adds, however, 'the saying that it was at his own desire, may have been at first only theoretical flight of some man of more wit than judgment. But the thought was pleasing, and therefore has been followed by many.' ''

I have quoted this at some length, to show the desire in those writers to destroy as much as they could: and to show their reluctant avowal of the impossibility of destroying the evidence that Peter was at Rome, and was there put to death. What then are we to think of the qualifications of the editor of the *Christian Advocate*, and of his clerical brother? What are we to say to the uninformed men who daily assert the most gross misstatements respecting a religion, of whose history they know so little? My friends, should their assertions be taken as proof?

I remain, my friends,

Yours, and so forth, B. C.

THE POPE'S DISPENSING POWER

INCLUDING AN HISTORICAL EXAMINATION OF THE PRINCIPAL CASES OF ITS EXERCISE.

[The occasion of the following controversial pieces on the much litigated question respecting the Papal power of dispensation, was this.—A writer in a monthly paper published in Boston, Mass., called the *Gospel Advocate,* commented with some severity upon the course taken by the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* which was then just beginning to attract the attention of the Protestant press, as the first and only Catholic periodical in the United States. This writer published in the number of the first-mentioned journal for October, 1822, the short article prefixed to the ensuing series. In this article he summed up the ordinary charges to be found on the pages of the chief controversial writers against the Church of Rome, based on the supposed claim and exercise of a supreme arbitrary power of dispensing from moral duties and obligations required and enjoined by the Divine Law. These charges he put forth as a palmary argument designed to bar even the right to a hearing, on the part of an advocate of the Catholic religion. The article was republished in the *Miscellany* for November 20th, 1822, the 25th number of the first Volume; and, in the next number, Dr. England commenced his reply,—of the ability and success of which those may judge, who shall carefully peruse the arguments of his opponent, and his refutation of them.]

To the Editor of the Gospel Advocate:

A weekly paper, called the *Roman Catholic Miscellany*, is published in Charleston, South Carolina, which I sometimes see and peruse. It is, as might be supposed from its title, devoted to the interests of the Roman Church; but, in addition to this, is filled with the local concerns of the Irish. In this paper of 10th July last, page 46, is the following paragraph:

> "To this moment, many well-disposed, and otherwise well-informed people in the south, are really under the impression, that Catholics believe the Pope can dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements."

Upon this passage, I ask permission to subjoin a few remarks.

If the Pope be infallible,—if the unity of the Roman Catholic Church in her faith, her discipline, and her conduct, be the same in all ages of the world, as the Catholics teach, and, I presume, believe, then the infallibility of his holiness, and the principles of the church, must be the same, in every respect, now as they were in days of old. If the Roman Catholics do not believe that the Pope "can dispense with obligation

of oaths," it is a gratifying evidence of the increasing illumination of their mind, of their honesty, their good sense, and their obedience to God, and the laws of the country in which they live. But, in this respect, I apprehend his holiness and they will be at issue; for we find it upon record, that the Popes not only claimed the right, but exercised the power of dispensing with the obligation of oaths.

I am, Mr. Editor, one of the "people in the south," who, from my course of reading, have believed in this fact. If my impressions are wrong, I freely declare I shall take pleasure in abandoning them. It is my desire to think well of all churches which are built upon the "Rock of Ages;" and I take more delight in viewing the bright than the dark side of a picture. On the present subject, I would wish that the fact could be proved against me. It is my wish to think differently from what I do; and if the following facts can be disproved, I shall cheerfully yield my opinion:

"For the dignity and deference of God's holy church," says Pope Gregory VII., "in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and royal administration King Henry, son of Henry, some time emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy church; and I absolve all Christians, subject to the empire, from that oath whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings; for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity, who doth endeavor to diminish the dignity of the church. Go to, therefore, most holy princes of the apostles, and what I said, by interposing your authority, confirm; and that all men may now at length understand, if ye can bind and loose in heaven, that ye also can upon earth take away and give empires, kingdoms, and whatsoever mortals can have."

Pope Urban II. declared that—

"Subjects are by no authority constrained to pay the fidelity which they have sworn to a Christian prince, who opposes God and his saints, or violateth their precepts."

"Pope Paschal II. deprived Henry IV., and excited enemies to persecute him; telling them that they could not offer a more acceptable sacrifice to God, than by impugning him who endeavoured to take the kingdom from God's church."

Pope Innocent III. deposed the Emperor Otho IV., when a council, held at Rome, ordained, that if a

"Temporal lord, being required and admonished by the church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical filth, he should, by the metropolitan, and the other comprovincial bishops, be noosed in the band of excommunication; and that if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the Pope, that he might from that time denounce the subjects absolved from their fealty to him, and to expose the territory to be seized on by Catholics."

Pope Innocent IV. declared the Emperor Frederick II. to be his vassal; and, in his general Council of Lyons, denounced a sentence of deprivation against him in the following words:

"We having, about the foregoing and many other his wicked miscarriages, had before a careful deliberation with our brethren and the holy council, seeing that we, although unworthy, do hold the place of Jesus Christ on earth, and that it was said unto us, in the person of St. Peter the Apostle, 'whatever thou shalt bind on earth,' the said prince, (who hath rendered himself unworthy of empire and kingdoms, and of all honour and dignity, and who, for his iniquities, is cast away by God, that he should not reign or command, being bound by his sins, and cast away and deprived by the Lord of all honour and dignity,) do show, denounce, and accordingly by sentence deprive; absolving all who are held bound by oath of allegiance, from such oath for ever."

Pope Boniface VIII. hath a decree extant in the canon law, running thus: "We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff;" and that he might not be misunderstood, he declares that "one sword must be under another, and the temporal must be subject to the spiritual power—whence, if the earthly power doth go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power." This was confirmed by Pope Leo X. and the Lateran Council.

Pope Clement V. declared, in the great Synod of Vienna, that the Emperor was subject to him.

Pope Clement VII. pretended to depose the Emperor Lewis IV.

Pope Pius V. begins his bull against Queen Elizabeth in these words:

"He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed the one holy catholic and apostolic church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone on earth, namely, to Peter, prince of the Apostles, and to the Roman pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with a plentitude of power: this one he hath constituted prince of all nations, and all kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruinate, plant, and build."

And in the same bull he declares that—

"He thereby deprives the queen of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and absolves all the nobles, subjects, and the people of the kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from their oath."

The bull of Pope Sixtus V. against Henry, King of Navarre, and the Prince of Conde, contains the following passage:

"By the authority of these presents, we do absolve and set free from all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, [of allegiance,] and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty, and obedience, and do charge and forbid all and every of them, that they do not dare to obey them, or any of their admonitions, laws, and commands."

The above extracts are taken from Barrow's *Works*, (tom. i. p. 540-543, fol. edit. Lond. 1741); where the original Latin is quoted. I shall make but one quotation more:

"The bull of deposition," says Bishop Burnet, "is printed in Cherubin's *Bularium Romanum*, which, since many have the confidence to deny matters of fact, though

most publicly acted, should be found in the collection of papers, the substance of it is as follows: 'The Pope, being God's vicar on earth, and according to Jeremy's prophecy, set over nations and kingdoms, to root out and destroy; and having the supreme power over all the kings in the whole world, was bound to proceed to due correction, and so forth. And declares, that if the king [Henry VIII.] and his complices do not appear, [at Rome,] he has fallen from the right to his crown, and they from the right to their estates; and when they die they were to be denied Christian burial. He put the whole kingdom under an interdict; and declares all the king's children by the said Anne, [Queen Anne Boleyn,] and the children of all his complices, to be under the same pains, though they be now under age, and incapacitates them for all honours or employments, and declares all the subjects or vassals of the king or his complices, absolved from all oaths or obligations to them, and requires them to acknowledge them no more.' This bull was dated at Rome, August 30, 1535, and was carried into execution by another, dated December 17, 1538."—Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, volume i. page 245, folio edition. Lond. 1681. See likewise Father Paul's *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, page 86, 87, London 1629, or in the Latin edition, A. D. 1622, page 97, 98.

The foregoing extracts, I trust, will be deemed sufficient to warrant the "people in the south" in believing that the Pope does, or did, claim and exercise the right of "dispensing with the obligation of oaths."

The Pope is a temporal sovereign, with troops at his command, as well as a bishop directing the spiritual concerns of the Church of Rome. In which capacity he pretends to this dispensing power, I am at a loss to determine. I do not see in the Scriptures, that St. Peter, or any of the Apostles, were commissioned to depose kings and rulers of nations, or to absolve their subjects from their oaths of allegiance. On the contrary, I find St. Peter saying, "sumbit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well."[13] As the dispensing power is not to be found in the Bible, it must be looked for among the traditions of the Romish Church, which the Roman Catholics say are of the same authority as the written word of God. If these traditions have ever been committed to paper, like the *Mishna*, I should like to see something which would give even a semblance of authority to the Bishop of Rome, for the exercise of the dispensing power. Pope Innocent IV. declared that "he held the place of Jesus Christ on earth." I shudder while I copy this blasphemy. Pope Pius V. declared, as we have seen, that he was "constituted prince over all nations and all kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruinate, plant, and build." The bull of Paul III. contains the same declaration, and quotes the prophet Jeremiah for his authority. In looking at this authority, we find

[13] *Peter*, i. 13, 14.

Jehovah speaking to the house of Israel!!![14] Is America included in this sweeping power of destruction? America was known when these bulls were issued. Does the Pope, then, arrogate this authority over the United States? Can he change our rulers who have been freely elected by a majority of our citizens? Ridiculous! If Roman Catholics think so, American Protestants do not. And as we do not choose to have our civil rights invaded by any power, secular or spiritual, we should be glad to know when, and by what Pope "the power of dispensing with oaths!" was officially and publicly relinquished? The Popes of old, no doubt, deemed the exercise of this dispensing power a right appertaining to the Roman See; but if any Pope, subsequent to those mentioned, has relinquished it, what becomes of the papal infallibility in the reign of those Popes, and of the vaunted unity of principles and action in the Roman Church? They cannot, surely, under these circumstances, be the same now as they were at the Reformation. If they are, then, according to the doctrine of the Romish Church, the Pope has the power of turning Mr. Monroe out of the presidential chair, as a heretic, and of placing a creature of his own in his place! Is this the opinion of Roman Catholics? It certainly is not the opinion of Protestants.

In the holy warfare against heretics, every Protestant is a heretic in their opinion; every Roman Catholic prelate is bound by his consecration oath, to aid and support the Pope. In his oath is the following passage:

Hoereticos, schismaticos et rebelles eidem domino nostro vel successoribus praedictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo. "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord [the Pope], or his aforesaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose."[15]

The oath, at length, in the original Latin, as well as a translation, will be found in Barrow. I will copy the latter for the information of those who have not had an opportunity of consulting the works of that author:

"I, N., elect of the Church of N., from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our lord, the lord N., Pope N., and to his successors canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands any wise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them under any pretence whatever. The counsel which they shall entrust me withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman papacy, and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the apostolic

[14] *Jerem.* xviii. 7-11.

[15] *Pontif. Rom.* Antwerp, Anno 1526, p. 59, and p. 86. Apud Barrow's *Works*, i. p. 553.

see, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any council, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and as soon as I can, will signify it to our said lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause them to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his aforesaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose. I will come to a council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the apostles every three years, and give an account to our lord and his aforesaid successors, of all my pastoral office, and of all things any wise belonging to the state of my church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and lastly, to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto specially empowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage; or in default of these, by a priest of the diocese; or in default of one of the clergy [of the diocese] by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs, to be transmitted by the aforesaid messenger to the cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church, in the congregation of the sacred council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor any wise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the chapter of my church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God, and the holy gospels of God.''

In conclusion, I would ask the jurist this question, merely for information, without deciding upon it myself: Whether a citizen of the United States can take this oath, and promise this obedience to the Pope, he being a foreign temporal prince, consistently with the allegiance he owes to the government of his own country?

ONE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH.

SECTION I.

''One of the People of the South on the Papal dispensation of Oaths:'' This title will be understood by the reader, after he shall have perused, in another part of the *Miscellany*, the article on the Papal dispensation of oaths, purporting to have been sent by ''One of the People of the South,'' to the editor of the *Gospel Advocate*, and inserted by him in

October issue, published in the city of Boston, and to whom we address this explanation, in the hope that he will have the kindness to insert it, for the purpose of enabling his readers, who have seen the allegations, to peruse also the answer, and thus possess the means of forming a correct judgment.

We shall take his topics in order: 1. We have many facts of "the local concerns of the Irish" in our paper, to give what we conceive a salutary lesson to our readers, by exhibiting the bad effects of persecution for conscience sake. The French refugee in the Southern States, and the son of the pilgrim in the Northern States will, of course, join with us in its inculcation.

2. The Roman Catholic Church does not teach that the Pope is infallible.[16] Did the writer vouchsafe to peruse all our numbers, he would find that we have at least six times within the six months that we are publishers, been under the necessity of repeating what we again assert. It is no article of the Roman Catholic faith, that the Pope is infallible. It never was an article of the Roman Catholic faith, that the Pope is infallible.

3. Catholics teach the faith of the Roman Catholic Church is the same in all ages. But they do not teach that her discipline and her conduct are the same in all ages.

4. Upon the subject of "dispensing with the obligation of oaths," his holiness and the Roman Catholics are not and will not be at issue.

The above remarks form our answers to his preliminary observations. We now come to the examination of his facts. He states it to be "upon record, that the Popes not only claimed but exercised the power of dispensing with the obligation of oaths;" and that he produces six facts to support his proposition, and then comes to the conclusion, that "he trusts they will be deemed sufficient to warrant the people in the south in believing that the Pope does, or did claim and exercise the right of dispensing with the obligation of oaths."

We have always been taught, that before entering upon an examination of any question, one of the most prudent steps we could take was to see clearly what the question was. Upon that principle, we now state the proposition mentioned by that writer to be, "That it was a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, that the Pope had the power of dispensing with the obligation of oaths." The proposition which he

[16] At the time of Bishop England's writing, the Infallibility of the Pope had not been declared an article of Catholic Faith. It was common Catholic belief, but not Catholic dogma. Not until 1870, did the Papal Infallibility become formal dogmatic teaching.—Ed.

contradicts, is what we published in page 46 [*Sup.* 401]; that proposition is reducible to this: "Catholics do not believe the Pope can dispense with the obligations of oaths." His proposition then must be reducible to the contradictory. "Catholics do believe the Pope can dispense with the obligation of oaths." His proofs are, "Catholic doctrine is always the same. But some Popes did dispense with certain oaths. Therefore Catholics believe the Pope can dispense with the obligation of oaths." Now we put it to the candour of the writer. Is his argument good? How many of the rules of syllogisms, which are but the maxims of right reason, does it violate?

First, suppose we allow all his facts to be true, in the sense which he wishes to have conveyed by them, what do those facts prove? They prove that Gregory VII., Innocent III., Innocent IV., Clement VI., Pius V., and Sixtus V. did absolve the subjects of certain princes from their allegiance. Here, then, we have only the acts of six Popes, and by those acts no Catholic is bound. The writer might as well have produced the criminal acts of six Popes, who could be named, and whose names and crimes he might have perused in the *Miscellany*, and conclude from those acts that Catholics believe it lawful for the Pope and people to commit sins. We beg to inform him, that the Roman Catholic doctrine is not to be learned from the acts of the Popes, as the doctrines of the Church of England is not to be learned from the acts of King Charles II., or King George IV., or the Bishop of Clogher. The first fault of his argument then was, attempting to prove doctrine by individual acts. Even those persons who believe the Pope to be infallible, for there are such individuals, though the Roman Catholic Church does require this belief, draw a very palpable distinction between the doctrinal decision of the Pope, and his private or even his public acts. Though they will receive solemn decisions of doctrine as rules for belief, they will condemn several of the Papal acts.

The next fault of the argument is, that from particular premises he draws a general conclusion. We have all those facts, and the others which are adduced of only one description, oaths of allegiance to sovereigns. Now, though it should be true that the Pope claimed a right of absolving from an oath of allegiance to a sovereign, it does not follow that he claimed the same right with respect to every other oath. Hence, supposing all the facts proved, the conclusion would only come to this—"It is a fact that some Popes claimed a right to dispense with the subjects of some monarchs from the observance of their oath of allegiance." This conclusion is amply proved. But it does not thence follow, that "it is believed by Catholics that the Pope can dis-

pense with the obligation of oaths generally." There might be a special ground for their power of absolving from oaths of allegiance, and still no ground for their absolving from other oaths; there might also be special grounds upon which they had this power with respect to some nations, which did not extend to other nations. This is only to be known by examination of facts.

Now let us examine the facts, to discover the principle of the Papal acts. They have regard to the emperors of Germany, to the King Henry VIII. of England, and to his daughter Elizabeth, and to Henry, King of Navarre. Perhaps in each of those cases we would find some special ground of justification for the interference. Surely the writer will not say that a monarch might not have forfeited the claim of allegiance, and his subjects be therefore justly absolved from their oaths to him. The writer will not, we trust, in his zeal for our respectable President, forget the grounds of Mr. Monroe's title to our support. Was not the ground of Mr. Monroe's authority a dispensation given to the inhabitants of the former British Colonies, from observing an oath? Did not General Washington take an oath of allegiance to King George the Third, of England, and to his heirs and successors? Did not Mr. Monroe himself take this oath? Did not some of the most respectable Episcopal clergy of the Union take this oath, and also take another oath in contradiction thereto? Have they not renounced that allegiance, waged war upon the king, put his subjects to death, annoyed his faithful servants, taken his ships, confiscated his property, and done every act of hostility, notwithstanding that oath? and have not those venerable clergymen, who swore that his majesty was the visible head in earth of the church, renounced that headship, and separated themselves from his majesty's jurisdiction, taken his name from their liturgies, and prayed for the success of his declared enemies? And shall we say that all the fathers of church and state in America were perjurers who violated their oaths? Shall we say that Mr. Monroe is but the leader of a band of powerful and organized rebels, who have violated their solemn oaths?

Look to the period of the British revolution of 1688. Did not the bishops, and the peers, and the clergy, and the laity of England, swear allegiance to James II., and afterwards rise up to oppose him, and forswear that allegiance, and swear allegiance to William III., who fought against James II.? Were they perjurers? Did they teach the doctrine of dispensing with oaths?

The explanation in these cases is simple. They were dispensed from the oaths by the misconduct of those to whom the oaths were taken, and there was in the oath that implied condition which must always sub-

sist between the governor and the governed,—justice and protection on the one side, and obedience on the other. The convention in England, and the convention in America, declared the fact of the governor having violated the contract, and thereby forfeited the right which he had, and thus absolved the people from the moral bond or obligation of the oath, which subsisted until that delaration was made; and thus the convention did in England and in America exactly what the Pope did in the case of Germany, and no more. This expresses the principle, so far as the laity are concerned, or as far as regards temporal allegiance. We shall not presume to insult the clergymen by explaining how the ecclesiastical bond was broken. They are more competent to the fulfilling of that task than we are. We do not pretend even to surmise the grounds for rejecting his majesty's ecclesiastical authority, as we do not know George III. to have been charged with any faults against the church.

All that was necessary, we presume, as far as relates to Germany, is that we should now show that the Pope had, as regarded the emperors, the same power that the convention had in England; and we shall thus have answered that part of the case so as to satisfy our southern friend.

We could wish he had extended his reading a little beyond Dr. Barrow and Bishop Burnet, who had both interested motives for publishing only a part, and not the whole of the facts in those several cases; and we suppose he has read more, and only needs to be reminded of some facts which have probably escaped his memory. We shall not then dwell upon them.

In the first place, he knows that the title of Emperor of the West became extinct in 476; the last who held the shadow of that dignity being Romulus Augustulus, Odoacer the Goth having assumed the reins of government as king of Italy. But in the year 800, the title of the Emperor of the Romans was created by Pope Leo III., who, upon Christmas day in that year, conferred it upon Charlemagne in the city of Rome. By the same authority his descendants held the same title. But upon the extinction of the Carlovingian race, in the commencement of the 10th century, after the following emperors of that line had reigned, viz., Lewis the Pious, Lothaire, Lewis II., Charles II., Lewis the Stammerer, Charles the Fat, Arnulph, and Lewis IV., otherwise Lewis the Infant, Conrad, duke of Franconia and Hesse, was in 912 elected by the German princes to the government of that part of the empire, but he was never recognised as emperor. Upon his recommendation, Henry, duke of Saxony, was chosen in his stead, upon his death in 919. He is generally known by the appellation of Henry the Fowler. He reconciled all parties to his interest, but died on his way to Rome to be crowned em-

peror, in 936, leaving his eldest son, Otho I., his successor. Otho was not crowned in Rome until 963, and is thus recognised as, properly speaking, the first emperor of Germany.

One part of the contract between the Pope and the Emperor was, that the latter should preserve to the former his temporal possessions against the incursions of the petty and lawless chieftains by whom he was surrounded and sometimes annoyed; and another was, that the Emperor would preserve to all the churches, and especially to that of Rome, all their rights, privileges, and immunities—and if he failed in the discharge of these duties, he consented to forfeit all right to the empire.

Previous to the death of Otho III., in the year 1000, he and Pope Gregory V., who was a German and a relative of his, had reduced the number of electors of the Emperors to seven princes of Germany, reserving to the Pope the power of confirming the election, without which it would be invalid, and also the right of crowning the person so elected and confirmed.

Thus we perceive, that in the beginning of the eleventh century, by the creation of the empire, by the custom of the age, and by special diplomatic regulations, the Pope had become possessed of the right of declaring who was Emperor of Germany, and of declaring when he ceased to have a claim upon the allegiance of his vassals, by having violated the conditions of his compact: and thus Pope Gregory VII., by the law of nations, had the very same rights in relation to the Emperor of Germany, that the British and American conventions had with respect to James II. and George III. The German electors had frequently declared Henry's violation of their rights, and had taken up arms against him; so too did the person who was constitutionally appointed to decide by confirmation, or otherwise. Thus, in the very document which the writer quotes, the Pope, Gregory VII., states the ground of his deposing King Henry, who was not yet emperor, to be the violation of this contract. One of the grounds only out of many, is quoted by the writer, and that but the sum of a special enumeration. "Who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy church." Like the Declaration of Independence, and every other state document, it carries the reason of its proceedings in the tenor of its statements, which are numerous.

We see, therefore, upon several titles, the Pope had a right to interfere in the election and confirmation, and to judge whether allegiance was or was not due to the claimants of the imperial crown. Not by divine right, but by human and temporary institution; and his exercise of this right is no part of the Roman Catholic religion.

This Henry IV., properly speaking, he was Henry III., for, as we

have seen, Henry the Fowler was not Emperor, had some qualities which were to be found in another of the same name. We do not take his character from the Pope's friends, but from his avowed enemies, and the eulogists of Henry, when it was possible to eulogize him; the compilers of the *Universal History* printed in London, 1782. We could give it in far worse colours by quoting from more impartial authors; however let us hear his friends. They state that one of his first acts upon coming of age, was to impose taxes which were not usual. If we recollect right one passage of the Declaration of American Independence charged George III., "for imposing taxes upon us without our consent." The Germans "murmured and traversed his design on pretence of defending their liberty, which they affirmed, he intended to invade." Really one would think these good editors were lecturing the founders of American liberty, and defending the King of England. "They were besides irritated against him on account of his debauches, and encouraged to rebellion by Pope Alexander II., who at the earnest solicitation of Hildebrand, his successor and confident, actually summoned the Emperor to Rome to give an account of his loose life, and to answer the charge of having exposed the investiture of benefices to sale."

We have before seen that by the constitution of the German empire, he could not be recognised as Emperor, nor claim allegiance, until he had been elected, confirmed, and crowned; as yet he was neither validly elected, confirmed, or crowned, therefore there was no allegiance due to him as emperor. We have also seen that had he been emperor, he violated the liberties of the people by arbitrary taxation, which was unconstitutional, and by simony, which was against the rights of the church, he violated the contract with the Pope. Thus he was not legally emperor, and had he been legally invested, he had exposed himself legally to the loss of the title and its appendages, as fully as George III. did to the loss of America.

His states presented him with a list of grievances, and concluded with assuring him that he should be respected, obeyed, and supported with their lives and fortunes, provided he would comply with those requests, but should he persist in his design to oppress them, they were resolved to defend themselves against violence and despotic power; and they did take up arms against him for his misconduct.

In all this we still find a strong resemblance to the conduct of the founders of American freedom, who in truth were the descendants of the ancestors of those brave Saxons, who thus proved that their veins still contained blood of the same nature as that which glowed in the hearts of the founders of British liberty. They were sprung from the

same fathers; and it must be a gratification to the American of this day to perceive that those Popes, whom interested historians misrepresent as the despots of the dark ages, were in truth the allies of the only people who cherished freedom, and who aided that people in preserving it against the attempts of powerful despots. It must also be to them a most gratifying reflection, that the very principles for which those Popes contended, and to preserve which they endured such persecution, are the same which, brought from Saxony through Britain, have made America great and happy.

Let us now hear the chief causes of Henry's dislike to Rome. Besides the opposition to his despotic schemes, "his incontinence was so great that he seldom or never set his eyes upon a beautiful young woman without endeavouring to sacrifice her virtue to his appetite. The vigilance of his wife being an obstruction to his amours, he conceived an unjust antipathy to that unfortunate princess, and even engaged one of his courtiers to undermine her chastity, that he might have a pretext for obtaining a divorce; but her conduct was so blameless and discreet, that his design miscarried, and he in vain solicited the Pope to dissolve the marriage."

He even plotted the assassination of the principal nobility opposed to his election, but finding his plans frustrated, and the electors assembled at Mentz to choose an Emperor, he hypocritically made declarations of sorrow, and procured their votes; he obtained the concurrence of Gregory VII. by similar means, having acknowledged himself guilty of simony and debauchery, and promising amendment and praying for absolution, which was granted upon his apparent contrition, and his solemn oath of future good conduct.

Gregory soon finding his conduct worse than ever, sent to admonish him, that unless he observed his promise, and governed with justice, and desisted from destroying religion by flagrant simony, he should proceed to depose him. Henry returned for answer, that the Pope was his vassal, that Gregory had entered into the popedom without having been appointed by him, and that he now deposed him from that popedom. Gregory excommunicated the Emperor, who went to Italy, and did public penance, and was absolved by the Pope on the 28th of January, 1078, upon swearing that he would not molest the Pope in future.

The Emperor had scarcely departed, after this hypocritical submission, when he became worse than ever, and openly declared his hostility to the Pope, and his determination to injure that church which he had so often sworn to protect; whereupon Gregory, as he was constitutionally warranted to do, pronounced him deposed from the place which

he had so unworthily filled, and the subjects of the empire freed from allegiance to him.

Did the writer peruse our answer to the writer in Washington, published in our last number, in answer to the charge made against Alexander III., he will find the abstract of the sequel of Henry's history, during the pontificate of Gregory. We have there called him Henry III., because we did not reckon Henry the Fowler amongst the Emperors; but some historians do, on which account this man is sometimes called Henry IV. It was respecting him that Urban II. made the declaration quoted also by our friend from the South, for Urban succeeded Pope Victor III., who is thought to have been poisoned by this same Henry. It was of him Paschal II. wrote what is quoted by the writer, who says he is from the South; and thus those acts must be solved upon the same principle.

The writer must feel that it is a principle of common law, as it is of common sense, that all official documents must be explained by the circumstances of the time and the place in which they are given; and where times, places, customs, rights of law, and opinions differ, no person laying claim to any character, will say the same principle is to govern the interpretation. Hence, though at that time in the German empire, by the customs of the age, by acquired rights, by well-known laws, and in the opinion of every jurist, the Pope had a right to depose the said Henry for the violation of a solemn contract, if he made one, and for usurpation if he did not: it by no means follows, that at this time, in this country, in violation of custom, right, and law, the Pope, who never made a contract with the people or government of this nation, has any right directly or indirectly to interfere in its concerns; and did he attempt it, every human being would smile at his folly, and every Roman Catholic in the States would feel it to be his duty before God, by the laws of nature, by the rights of nations, by his solemn oath, and by the principles of his religion, to take up arms to defend his country against the unjust and wicked aggressions of the Pope, with as much alacrity as against the aggressions of any other unprincipled invader.

We shall resume the subject in our next. B. C.

SECTION II.

In our last number we showed the palpable distinction between the relation in which the Popes stood during the eleventh and twelfth centuries to the Emperors of Germany, and that in which the present Pope stands towards his excellency the President of the United States of

America; therefore our venerable friend to the south of Boston, and to the north of the Southern States, need be under no apprehension from an analogy which does not exist; neither need he fear for the attachment of those men who hold principles to the congeniality of which to our free constitution Washington, the father of his country, bore honourable testimony—men who have never been even suspected of an approach to indifference for the blessings of the liberty and independence of the States. Catholics were found in the Convention, in the Congress, in the State Legislatures, in the governorship of some of the States, in command in the navy and the army, and in the ranks, and on board the ships. The first Catholic Bishop of America was the friend and the acquaintance, and we believe on a particular occasion, the confidential envoy of the first President of the Union, and never, that we can learn, was the attempt made openly to fling upon the Catholics the stigma of not being tenable by oaths, until the writer who assumes the signature of "One of the People of the South," came forward to assure us that if the Catholics now thought the Pope had not the power of dispensing with oaths, the Catholic religion must have changed; and he produces for his evidence in support of so serious a charge a few acts of a few Popes, and no doctrinal declaration of principle.

We have shown that the German cases did not establish the principle. We stated the declaration of Pope Urban II., regarding the case of Henry of Germany; and though Dr. Barrow, or his copyist, we cannot say which, brings forward the proposition in general terms, "subjects are by no authority constrained to pay the fidelity which they have sworn to a Christian prince who opposes God and his saints, and violates their precepts;" yet this apparently universal assertion is really but a particular proposition, the meaning of which, and the application of which, is actually restrained by the circumstances to the particular case of Germany, which was that under consideration.

One of the great causes of complaint which Catholics always have had against their opponents is, that they misrepresent the tenets of the Catholics. Thus they seldom attack the real doctrines of the Catholic Church. There is no species of misrepresentation worse than concealing part of the truth, and giving statements which, though true in themselves, yet stripped of their circumstances, convey to the mind wrong impressions. It is the worst sort of deceit. We shall illustrate this by an example which is intelligible to the people of the South.

Suppose a traveller published to the world that in Carolina he was present when a number of men were tried for their lives by a regular constitutional court, and that the court impanelled no jury, and declared

no jury was allowed by the State, and that the court further declared that the witnesses need not be confronted with the prisoners. Such a writer would convey to the world a false impression, though he would have stated nothing but what was strictly true. And he would have done exactly what was done by the person who extracted the declaration of Urban II.; he would have only concealed the most material fact which was the key to the full and satisfactory explanation of the entire; and the publication of which would show that so far from this being the general law, it was an exception, viz. the case of negro slave conspirators.

If the declaration of Urban II. were a general proposition of Catholic doctrine, its meaning would be "that no allegiance was due to a Christian prince who violated the precepts of God." The writer who could prove this to have been defined as faith in the Catholic Church, would indeed have for ever put down the doctrine of infallibility, and proved the whole of our system to be erroneous, for the Catholic Church condemned this doctrine as heretical when it was taught by Wickliffe and Huss, and the German boors, and some of the Puritans of England and Scotland. We shall perhaps soon be informed that it was from Urban II. the doctrine was learned by John Knox and his brethren.

Upon a little careful investigation of history, our venerable southern friend will find, to his great satisfaction, that this doctrine, which he was afraid was taught by the Popes, was taught in contradiction to them by their opponents.

Henry the Fourth was either the person whom we have described in our last as Henry III. of Germany, if so the acts of Paschal II. are explained exactly as those of Gregory and Urban have been, or what we think more probable, he was the son who is by some called Henry V., who was if possible still worse than his father, a vile hypocrite, a flagitious, bloody tyrant, who usurped the empire in a manner which exhibited a complication of irregularities; and Paschal only performed his duty as principal elector and defender of the rights of the Roman empire by depriving such a monster of the sway which he held.

The next case is that of Innocent III. and Otho IV. Of course the principle of solution being known, the difficulty vanishes. The acts of any Pope, with respect to his treaties with nations or sovereigns, are no part of the Roman Catholic religion; neither are Roman Catholics obliged to believe, that in making those treaties, or observing or departing from them, the Pope acted properly and religiously. For his acts he is to be judged by the Lord, and it is impossible for us, at this moment, to

pass judgment upon cases with all the circumstances of which we are not sufficiently acquainted.

But a new feature is here exhibited. A general council, which was held at Rome, ordained, that if "a temporal lord being required and admonished by the church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical filth, he should, by the metropolitan and the other provincial bishops, be noosed in the band of excommunication; and that, if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the Pope, that he might, from that time, denounce the subjects absolved from their fealty to him, and expose the territory to be seized by Catholics." Thus it is insinuated, that as this was a general council, this declaration must be a part of our doctrine.

There are here two mistakes. The first of doctrine, the second of fact. The Catholic Church looks upon a general council to be infallible in declaring and defending what are the doctrines of faith, which have been revealed; and in declaring and defending principles of morality founded upon reason and revelation, and teaches that all her children are bound to receive those decisions, and are bound to obey the regulations of ecclesiastical discipline, which are made for the whole church in those councils. She recognises in the council no farther power.

Now, this canon of the Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III., which is the third of the 70 canons of that church, is not a decision concerning a doctrine of faith, is not a decision of a principle of morality, is not a regulation of ecclesiastical discipline, and therefore is no part of the Roman Catholic religion, neither has it ever been considered as such. Thus it is, to say the least, a great mistake of our doctrine to assert that this is a portion of our religion; and assuming this mistake as a principle, all the arguments drawn from it must be inapplicable.

The mistake of fact is the supposition that this council consisted merely of bishops and other churchmen, and that this canon was made by mere ecclesiastical authority.

In the first place, the two emperors and several other monarchs sent their ambassadors to the Council, several of the archbishops and bishops were princes of extensive territories, and many proxies for other princes attended, so that the assembly consisted of two descriptions of persons, having separate and distinct objects, though many of the member had votes on each subject. The bishops as pastors only drew up and regulated the decisions of faith, morality, and discipline, and the temporal powers or congress of princes, made regulations for temporal government; and as the object of this assembly was twofold, the canons or laws are also twofold; and each referable to the proper

source of authority, as its nature is either ecclesiastical or temporal, and a few of them are mixed. Now this third canon is of the latter sort, and it is a mixed law concurred in by both authorities. The object was the clearing of the territories of "heretical filth:" and any person who is at all acquainted with the history of the time, and has the smallest share of candour must allow that the very existence of society required measures of very extraordinary severity to preserve a considerabde part of Europe from the unnatural consequences of Manicheism, as well as from the principles of Lollardism. The principles of both those sects were what was specially described as "heretical filth," and princes, as well as prelates, found it necessary to root them out. The law was rather a temporal than an ecclesiastical canon; and as it was inserted amongst the ecclesiastical laws, in consequence first of its treating of heresy, and next of ecclesiastical persons, this circumstance of its insertion caused the misrepresentation of the Council having usurped a right to depose princes.

Now we come to consider the nature of this law. It has several enactments. 1. It regulates, that the punishment of condemning heretics must be left to the secular powers. This does not look like arrogating it to the church. The church may declare the fact of heresy as a jury does in its verdict; this is all its power in a temporal point of view—the mere simple declaration of the fact. 2. If the heretics be clergymen, they shall be first degraded from their orders, and their property confiscated to the churches whence it was derived. So far it was an act of the Council of Bishops. 3. The property of lay heretics was confiscated to the State. This was an enactment of the Congress. 4. If the temporal lord (i. e. a feudatory), being required by the church, did not clear his territory of heretical filth, he was to be excommunicated. This was ecclesiastical. 5. If he remained a year negligent, he was to be reported to the Pope, who was to declare, that by his neglect he forfeited all right to allegiance, and so forth. *Quo jure?* Was it by his spiritual authority? By no means—but by the consent of the Congress which made and sanctioned this enactment. It was a new power granted to the Pope by the States, whose representatives made the law. Thus it was no more a usurpation of the Pope to exercise this newly acquired right in all cases in which those States might bave been subsequently involved, than it would be a usurpation for the President of the United States to use the power given to him by the Congress of those States within their several territories; and in fact the whole of Christendom was met in that Congress by its representatives, and freely gave its president, the Pope, this power. 6. Was a clause by the same

authority, reserving the rights of seignory of the lords paramount, or chief emperors or kings, notwithstanding the possible forfeiture by the puisne baron, prince, or vassal, or holder under a fief tenure. 7. By the same authority, a clause extending the penalties to chieftains and lords exempt, who held not in fief but in chief. All those enactments were made by the Congress upon subjects under their power, but over which the Pope, by his spiritual jurisdiction, had no authority; but by this law, he was invested with power, and might lawfully absolve the subjects of those states from their oaths of fealty, when the church found the facts of heresy and negligence. We do not here mean to enter upon the examination of the propriety or impropriety of the law; but we have ascertained the fact, that in this year the law was made and the power conferred, and therefore it might by the law of nations be used, and its use was no usurpation on the part of the executive officer. The remaining enactments of the third canon are merely ecclesiastical, regarding preachers.

The next fact produced is that of Pope Innocent IV. declaring Frederick II. to be his vassal—and in his general Council of Lyons denouncing sentence or deprivation against him a certain form of words. We do not suppose the form is of much account if he had a right to make this assertion and to pronounce this deprivation.

First. The Popes did obtain and hold for a considerable time the principality of Sicily, and the usual acknowledgements were made to them as chiefs and sovereigns thereof. Frederick had only a small portion of Germany, besides the Dutchy of Swabia, together with Naples and Sicily, for his hereditary dominions; these latter were fiefs of the Holy See, not in virtue of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, but of his temporal power, and Frederick was his vassal for those territories. At his coronation as Emperor of Germany by Honorius III. he swore to defend the possessions of the Holy See, including the fiefs of the Countess Matilda, in Fondi, and to go into Asia, upon the requisition of the Pope, to aid the crusaders. He ravaged the possessions of the Holy See several times, usurped the fiefs of Fondi, evaded more than once his pledge regarding the crusades, excited civil wars in the states of the church, and let Saracens loose upon Italy, was rejected by the German electors, is stated by his friends to have been unprincipled, ambitious, violent, and a debauchee; not only a heretic, but an atheist, and openly impious. We leave our friend in the South then to determine upon how many grounds, according to the principles of civil polity, he lost his claim to the crown of Germany; and upon how many valid grounds of the law of nations, by the principles of the age, and by how many special and

positive laws, the Pope was warranted in deposing him by any form of words he might think proper. Still the Roman Catholic religion is no part of this, nor is this any part of the Roman Catholic religion. What in the name of common sense has all this to do with Mr. Monroe and Pope Pius VII.?

Our friend in the South not having vouchsafed to give us a reference to the decree of Pope Boniface VIII., which he says is found in the canon law, we are not able to examine the topic as we would wish. We suppose the words are quoted correctly. We then shall take his proposition. "We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." The proposition in one sense is true—in another it is false. Now, the writer who thinks well of a church built on "the Rock of ages," must acknowledge that it is necessary for every human creature to be subject to that power to which Christ made it subject. Roman Catholics do believe, 1. That Christ placed every human creature under the spiritual charge of his Apostles. 2. That the head of those Apostles was St. Peter. 3. That his successor, who is also head of all the other successors of the other apostles in the Roman Pontiff, and therefore they believe it to be necessary for every human creature, by Christ's ordinance to be subject in spiritual things to the Roman Pontiff. In this sense the proposition is true. But what then? Therefore, the Pope can dispense with the obligations of oaths, contracts, and so forth. Now we shall put a case. There is in the city of New York a respectable Protestant Bishop. Some persons are subject to his spiritual jurisdiction. Therefore, this respectable gentleman can dispense with the obligation of oaths, and so forth. The Right Reverend Dr. Hobart would protest against such a conclusion as unwarranted by common sense, and upon the same principle he would assure "One of the People in the South," that such supposed conclusions as Dr. Barrow's would be equally ridiculous. "But the Pope says the temporal power must be subject to the spiritual power." We too say, if there be question of spiritual things, it must most undoubtedly. To follow up our former comparison, we have no doubt but if Governor Clinton be one of Dr. Hobart's flock, the right reverend gentleman claims just as much jurisdiction over the governor as if Mr. Clinton were merely a private citizen; for it happens, that in America the chief ruler has lost that commission of being "head in earth of the church," which was founded by King Henry VIII. in England; and hence in England, George IV. is head of the church, but in America no temporal ruler is head of the church. But the Popes claim as head of the church only that right

which Dr. Hobart claims of governing spiritually the holder of the civil sword, equally as the victim upon whom that sword is used. So that in this respect neither Pope Boniface VIII. nor Pope Leo X. nor the Lateran Council, claimed more for the spiritual power in the proper sense of the proposition, than good Protestants also claim. But if the Pope meant to say that the spiritual power had authority to regulate temporal concerns by virtue of its spiritual commission, the proposition is untrue, and is no part of the Roman Catholic religion.

"Pope Clement V. declared, in the great Synod of Vienna, (it ought to be the General Council of Vienne,) that the emperor was subject to him."

If the Pope was head of the church, and the emperor a member of that church, there can be no doubt but the member was subject to the head.

"Therefore, the 'Pope could dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements.' "

From such bad logic good Lord preserve us! Oh, no. The people of the South will remember the rule of all reasoning. "The premises should clearly contain the conclusion." Governing the church, and dispensing with oaths, and so forth, are two very different things.

"Pope Clement VI. pretended to depose the Emperor Lewis IV."

It would have been shorter to have written, "Clement VI. deposed Lewis IV." The facts are, Lewis, Duke of Bavaria, after having had a minority of the suffrages of the electors, was refused confirmation by Pope John XXII., who confirmed Frederick, that had been elected by the majority; but Lewis, being a better soldier, was successful, and not only triumphed over the Emperor Frederick, but shut him up in prison, and then having extorted from the electors an assent to his title, he went to Rome and procured some bishops to crown him as emperor, notwithstanding the Pope's opposition. Lewis then assuming the spiritual as well as the temporal sword, condemned the Pope as an heretic, excommunicated him, and proceeded to the formality of deposing him and establishing another in his stead. Meeting with a series of disasters, he, in 1330, sought pardon and reconciliation with the Pope, which was refused so long as he continued his usurpation. John dying in 1334, was succeeded by Benedict XII. who, for the same reasons, adhered to the same line of conduct as his predecessor. In 1342, Benedict was succeeded by Clement VI. and for the same reasons Clement declared Lewis an usurper, and never to have been lawful Emperor of Germany, but merely Duke of Bavaria. Lewis dying in 1346, put an end to the contest, and Charles IV. of Bohemia, succeeded by the regular form of the Germanic constitution. Whether Clement's conduct in

the discharge of his duty as chief elector of the empire of the West, was correct or incorrect, has no connexion whatever with the Roman Catholic religion, nor with Mr. Monroe's title to the Presidency of the United States, and the duty of its citizens, of all religions, to support him in the discharge of his functions, and therefore we humbly and respectfully conceive, with all the due deference, however, for Dr. Barrow and One of the People of the South of Boston, that no one of the German cases, nor the whole put together, will prove that it is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic religion, that the Pope can dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements. We shall examine the other cases in succession. B. C.

SECTION III.

Having disposed of the German cases, we now come to the English cases.

Our friend in the South quotes two of these; that of the Pope against King Henry VIII., and that against Elizabeth. Now, let us examine the cases by the principle. The proposition which we laid down was, "Catholics do not believe the Pope can dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements." Of course we meant, that it was not the doctrine of Roman Catholics that the Pope, by his spiritual authority, could dispense with these moral obligations upon conscience. Our friend in the South means to prove, that "Catholics believed that the Pope could dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements." Meaning, of course, that by his spiritual authority, Catholics did believe his holiness could discharge them from the moral obligations thus incurred. To prove this, he adduces a fact, that the Pope dispensed the subjects of King Henry VIII. of England, from the moral obligation of their oath of allegiance. We answer, that admitting the fact, the conclusion is not correct, because the Pope may absolve the people. and yet the Pope may know he is doing wrong. The Pope may dispense with the obligation, and think he has the power, and the people still know that he has not the power, and not believe the dispensation good. And there is a third case. The Pope might, as in the German cases, know that he had the power, and the people knowing that he had, believe themselves dispensed with, and yet the power be in the Pope not as head of the church, but by virtue of his authority, in consequence of a contract, or upon some other ground; so that merely prov-

ing that the Pope declared the people dispensed from the oath, proves nothing.

Now, we unhesitatingly assert, that by the old feudal system the Pope had the power, not as head of the church, but upon three or four other grounds. We do not mean to assert that the acts which we are about to recite were proper or becoming, but that they did take place. In the first place, Henry was king of Ireland, by virtue of a bull of a Pope. Adrian IV., at the request of Henry II., gave him a bull to conquer and to govern Ireland: now, though we consider that bull worth just as much as a tailor might give for the old parchment, and worth no more, yet this was the title upon which the kings of England claimed the sovereignty of Ireland, and by virtue of which the orators and ambassadors of the British monarchs claimed, and were allowed in the general councils, a precedence to which they would not otherwise be entitled; the kingdom of Ireland being a much more ancient sovereignty than most others. Upon this ground, the Pope had his first claim; if he could give, he could deprive. [17]

In the second place, John, King of England, shamefully made his kingdom a fief of the Holy See. He ought not to have done so, but the fact is he did; and the kings of England paid tribute to Rome after this, as vassals of the Holy See. The Pope then had a claim to interfere as liege lord, by his title of lord paramount, and not by his title as head of the church.

Again. The ambassadors of England were parties to the agreement of the potentates at the Council of Lateran, in 1215, that any prince who refused to clear his dominions of heresy within twelve months, should be declared deposed by the Pope: and this canon was still strongly supported in England.

Another ground was, that Henry himself did accept the title of Defender of the Faith from the Pope, for his works against Luther. Thus the Pope had several grounds or pretexts, for interfering with the government of Henry VIII., not one of which concerns Mr. Monroe. The Pope did not interfere in the deposition of the king merely by spiritual power, because this was no prerogative of St. Peter, but he interfered by virtue of the concessions of English kings, and of their agreement, and that of their ambassadors, and by reason of the custom of the age.

But the true question is not, whether the Pope believed he had power to depose the king, or attempted to depose him, without having the power, but whether it be a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church,

[17] Several very accurate historians have recently proved quite satisfactorily that the much discussed Bull of Adrian IV is an historical myth.—Ed.

that the Pope has the power of dispensing with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements. We freely concede to "One of the People in the South," that Popes did sometimes assume power which they really had not by law or by right; but the assumption of a Pope is not the doctrine of the church. We will allow, that, although by the customs of the age, the Pope had many apparent plausible titles for interference in the temporal government of England, upon the grounds above stated, he had by no means the same right which his predecessors had in the German cases; for the crown of England was, and ought to be, independent of the Bishop of Rome; and Adrian had no right or power to grant Ireland to Henry II., nor had John any power to make his dominions a fief of the Holy See. All these transactions were deordinate, and arose from the unwarranted interference of the laity in ecclesiastical concerns, which improper conduct produced the reaction of the churchmen meddling in temporal affairs, and the subsequent blending of church and state together through Europe.

Now, let us see the fact, for the purpose of ascertaining the Catholic doctrine. Did the British people consider themselves freed from their allegiance? And was it the doctrine of the church, that they were absolved? These two questions are the true test to solve the difficulty. We unhesitatingly answer, the people continued in their allegiance to Henry, notwithstanding the absolution; and those people at the time were principally Catholics. Sir Thomas More, the chancellor, was beheaded for denying the king's supremacy: that is, for not changing his religion, to conform to the king's humour; yet he never considered himself absolved from his allegiance. We, in like manner assert, that neither Mr. Monroe, nor the Congress of the United States, nor the Governor of South Carolina, nor the Houses of Assembly of the State, have any authority to require of us to change our religion; but, that any attempt of theirs to interfere, would be a tyrannical usurpation; and we also assert, that we owe allegiance to them, from which neither the Pope nor the whole church could absolve us. Bishop Fisher was put to death for not deserting the Roman Catholic faith; yet he never considered himself, or any other Roman Catholic, freed from allegiance to the king of England, who, *de jure* and *de facto*, was Henry VIII.; nor could he constitutionally, without the leave of his parliament, give the Pope power to depose him, or to absolve his subjects from their allegiance.

Now, in the first place, Mr. Hume informs us, that, although the censures were passed, they were never openly denounced, that is, published. Secondly. It is no part of the Catholic doctrine that the Pope, as head of the church, has power to depose kings, though he has power to

excommunicate or place them under spiritual censures. Thirdly. The fact is, that frequently the Popes received temporal authority, by which they could lawfully depose particular monarchs, and absolve their subjects from allegiance in particular cases. Fourthly. Some Popes did endeavour to make this special concession a general law. Fifthly. Some Popes and their flatterers did endeavour to argue, that what was thus granted as a favour, or human concession, was an inherent right of the Holy See. Sixthly. But this was never the doctrine of the church. And, seventhly. In several places, where the Popes did unwarrantably attempt to exercise this power, the Roman Catholics did resist them, and were not therefore considered less faithful members of the church.

If it were a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that the Pope could dispense with the obligation of the oath of allegiance to Henry VIII., when he did command the Catholics to withdraw their allegiance, they would have done so; yet we do not find they did withdraw it. Bishops, priests, and laity still adhered to him as their temporal sovereign, but they did not follow him in his religious aberrations, and they were still members of the church. The English nobility were frequently and justly indignant, in those times, when they were Catholics, at the attempts made to assert a right of the Bishop of Rome to interfere in the temporal concerns of the nation. And now although their sovereign was a rebel to the church, they could see no ground for the assumption of his holiness to depose their king, and to absolve his subjects from their allegiance; therefore, they did not believe that the Pope could dispense in oaths, contracts, and agreements.

The case of Elizabeth is stronger than that of Henry. She was not constitutionally queen of England, except by the choice and consent of the people, for she was not the legitimate daughter of Henry. Elizabeth was born of a woman who lived with Henry, during the lifetime of his lawful wife. The Roman Pontiff, who did not acknowledge the validity of her mother's marriage, could not allow the legitimacy of her birth; and, down to that moment when Henry broke off communion with Rome, every Christian in England had always acknowledged, that Rome was the final and superior court of appeals, to decide the validity or invalidity of marriage.

This objection was superadded to those which existed against her father, together with a new one arising from her organizing a church in opposition to the See of Rome, and her persecuting her Catholic subjects, and exciting the Protestants of Catholic States to oppose their rulers.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, her Catholic subjects, the priests

whom she had hanged, the nobility whose titles were lost, and whose lands were confiscated, all classes of her Catholic subjects declared their allegiance to her, and never were accused of disobeying her, under pretext of the Bull. On the contrary, the Catholics of England declared that they could not be absolved by any person from their duty to their sovereign. It is true, that pretended plots and conspiracies were spoken of, for the purpose of leading to the murder of the Queen of Scots. It is true, that Sixtus V. issued a bull of deposition, and so forth; but Mr. Hume himself gives us his testimony to one fact, the truth of which upsets all those fabrications, and proves our proposition.

Speaking of the preparations of Elizabeth to meet the Spanish Armada, he informs us, that "the firmest support of her throne consisted in the general zeal of the people for the Protestant religion, and the strong prejudices which they had imbibed against Popery. She took care to revive in the nation this attachment to their own sect, and this abhorrence of the opposite." In her speech to her troops in the camp at Tilbury, she styles the Spaniards, on account of their Catholicity, "enemies of her God." Yet the Catholics did not rise up in arms against her. Mr. Hume informs us, that Elizabeth knew how they would act, for she knew the principles of their religion. "She would not believe that all her Catholic subjects could be so blinded as to sacrifice to bigotry their duty to their sovereign, and the liberty and independence of their native country. She rejected all violent councils, by which she was urged to seek pretences for dispatching the leaders of that party." Our friend in the South will see by this, the explanation of many of the Popish plots; for an Elizabeth was not always queen of Protestant England. "She would not confine any considerable number of them." Though to gratify the wishes of her tolerant subjects of other denominations, she was always obliged to keep some in confinement, and to have some occasionally hanged, bowelled, beheaded, and quartered, and sometimes burned. "And the Catholics, sensible of this good usage"—we know not whether this good usage would be greatly relished by our Protestant friends—"generally expressed great zeal for the public service. Some gentlemen of that sect, conscious that they could not justly expect any trust or authority, entered themselves as volunteers in the fleet or army." And why, we would ask Mr. Hume, would it be injustice to place trust in those men? or to confide authority to those men? And yet we are perpetually stunned with the repetition of Protestant liberality and Popish bigotry!!! How strong is that force of habit! "Some 'Catholics' equipped ships at their own charge, and gave the command of them to Protestants." We call upon our friend in the

South to produce an instance of persecuted Protestants, equipping at their own charge, ships to attack a Protestant power at war with their persecutors, and giving the command to Catholics! "Others were active in animating their tenants, and vassals, and neighbours to the defence of their country."

We could multiply quotations, but it would be useless. Our southern friend must allow, that neither Queen Elizabeth, nor those Catholics believed that it was a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that the Pope had the power of dispensing with the obligation of oaths, contracts, or agreements; and the English cases prove as little as the German.

B. C.

SECTION IV.

The last case of those adduced is that of Henry, King of Navarre. The argument is this: "Sixtus V. absolved the persons who had sworn allegiance to Henry, King of Navarre, and to the Prince of Conde, from the obligation of that oath; therefore it is plain that Catholics believe that the Pope can dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements." We admit the fact, that on September 9th, 1585, Sixtus V. did issue a bull excommunicating Henry and the Prince of Conde, and absolving their vassals from allegiance, and so forth. But we deny the conclusion to be legitimate.

First. Suppose the Pope acted against the doctrine of the church, his act would be no proof that the doctrine was consonant to this act. To state that the acts of the Popes are no evidence of the doctrine is then by no means incorrect. We find many instances where the papal acts were in direct opposition to the Catholic doctrine. Did the Catholic church teach that it was lawful for Alexander VI. to commit murder, or any of the other crimes which disgrace his character?

Again: We are not to decide from the acts of the Pope, but from the conduct of the people, what were the feelings and the dispositions of the people. Now, if the Catholics who had sworn allegiance to those princes were still faithful, notwithstanding the bull, will it not be more natural to conclude, that those Catholics did not believe the Pope had the power of dispensing from the obligation of their oaths? And the fact is, they were faithful; and not only they were so, but the great body of the French Catholics, who were opposed to the King of Navarre at that time, condemned the papal act, and denied the power of his holiness to absolve those people from their oaths. Thus the evidence is, that the Roman Catholics, to whom the bull was directed, did not believe the

Pope had the power of dispensing with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements.

The state of France and Navarre was at this period most unfortunate. The war between the Huguenots and the League was destructive; the family of Guise looked upon the King of Navarre and his adherents to be rebels to their liege lord the King of France. The King of Navarre had embraced the Roman Catholic faith, and relapsed into Calvinism.

The leaders of the League, the chiefs of the house of Guise, represented to the Pope, that by the feudal regulations the King of Navarre, having disobeyed his liege lord the King of France, had lost all claim to allegiance from his own vassals; and also, by the regulations and agreements of the princes in several councils, the King of Navarre had lost all title to his crown by having relapsed into heresy: they therefore called upon the Pope to issue his bull, declaring, according to those provisions, and the custom of the times, that the King of Navarre and the Prince of Conde had lost their titles, and that their subjects were absolved from their oaths:—not by the spiritual authority of the church, but by the regulations of the states and princes.

France was Catholic, yet the greatest part of France opposed this bull, as Davila and De Thou inform us. The Parliament was Catholic, yet the whole Parliament waited upon King Henry III., requesting he would order the bull to be torn, and those who solicited the bull to be punished. It was never accepted in France—it was never published. Henry himself appealed against it, and had his appeal filed in Rome. Wraxall, in his history of France, tells us, "The Catholics themselves, far from approving the excommunication, saw with regret and concern that its effects would be more beneficial than injurious to the party against whom it was directed . . . Even Sixtus himself . . . uniformly refused to open the treasury of the church, or to contribute in any manner to the war declared against the Huguenots."

Thus it is evident, that no Catholic who had sworn allegiance to those princes withdrew this allegiance in consequence of this bull; and it is plain that the Catholics of France and Navarre generally believed that they were not dispensed from the obligation of their oaths, although there were at least plausible grounds for the conduct of the Pope in the circumstances of the case.

Thus, neither the German, the English, nor the French cases will prove that it is the doctrine of the Catholic church, or that Catholics believe that the Pope can dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, or agreements.

The writer concludes by stating,

"The foregoing extracts will, I trust, be deemed sufficient to warrant the 'People in the South' in believing that the Pope does, or did claim and exercise the right of 'dispensing with the obligation of oaths.'"

Had he given the conclusion thus: "The extracts prove that some Popes did claim and exercise the right of dispensing with oaths of allegiance in particular cases;" we would allow his conclusion was fairly drawn; but this proposition does not contradict ours: "Catholics do not believe the Pope can dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and argreements." The question was, what do Catholics believe, not, what did some Popes claim. Some Popes have claimed what Catholics have never conceded to their ambition.

The writer next states,

"The Pope is a temporal sovereign, with troops at his command, as well as a bishop directing the spiritual concerns of the Church of Rome. In which capacity he pretends to this dispensing power, I am at a loss to determine."

We are at no loss however to inform him, in neither capacity: because he does not pretend to it, nor claim it at present. We have seen, by the examination of the German cases, that it was founded upon special concessions, and not upon general right. The Popes did originally claim it upon the ground of those concessions, and the claim was valid. Some of their flatterers sought to make it an essential prerogative of the spiritual governor of the church, but this claim was evidently unsupported; for, as "One of the People in the South" very properly observes, the Scriptures do not show us that St. Peter received any such commission; and we assure him that neither tradition nor the *Mishna* testify any such commission; and the Catholic Church has never acknowledged it; and he could have adduced many better texts of Scripture to disprove the claim as of divine right, than that of St. Peter, which proves nothing in the case. Roman Catholics deny it to be one of their doctrines, and still our friend in the South will insist upon their acknowledging it to be one of their doctrines. This indeed is generous, to make us believe it whether we will or not.

Our object was to show this friend of ours that his premises did not contain his conclusions, and that even his conclusion did not contradict our assertion. We believe we have succeeded in the attainment of this object. We now repeat, that it is no doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that the Pope can dispense in the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements.

The writer, however, has gone farther. In his zeal he has not only forgotten texts of Scripture, but he has accused the inspired writer of blasphemy.

"Pope Innocent IV., declared that 'he held the place of Jesus Christ on earth.' I shudder whilst I copy this blasphemy."

Now it must be evident to every person, that the Pope claims no more in this expression than St. Paul does when he says, (*I Cor.* iii. 9), "For we are God's coadjutors." (Chap. iv.) "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God." (*II Cor.* v. 20). "We are ambassadors for Christ." (*Luke* x. 16). "He that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me," were the words of the Saviour to minor ambassadors. Our friend in the South then must either deny this to be Scripture, or deny the Pope to have apostolic power, or charge the Saviour and his Apostle with the blasphemy. For when the Saviour was leaving this earth, he left the Apostles to hold his place on earth, and therefore it is no blasphemy to say what is correctly the fact. We could remind our friend in the South, perhaps, of the time and the place, when and where, he stated that he held himself the place of Jesus Christ on earth, and yet did not shudder at solemnly and deliberately asserting, if he will so have it, the blasphemy.

"Pope Pius V. declared, as we have seen, that he was 'constituted prince over all nations and all kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruinate, plant, and build.' The bull of Paul III. contains the same declaration, and quotes the Prophet Jeremiah for his authority. In looking at this authority, we find it is Jehovah speaking to the house of Israel! ! !" (Note to *Jerem.* xviii. 7-11).

Now, if a Roman Catholic were to do what has been done here, either by our friend in the South, or by Dr. Barrow, he would deserve perpetual execration; but others are so often in the habit of doing what has here been done, that they are not so much to be blamed.

In *Jeremiah* xviii. 7, we read as follows the words of Jehovah:

"I will suddenly speak against a nation and against a kingdom, to root out, and to pull down and to destroy it. If that nation against which I have spoken, shall repent of their evil, I also will repent of the evil that I have thought to do against them. And I will suddenly speak of a nation and of a kingdom, to build up and to plant it. If it shall do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, I will repent of the good that I have spoken to do to it. Now, therefore, tell the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, Thus saith the Lord: Behold, I frame evil against you, and devise a device against you: let every man return from his evil way, and make ye your ways and your doings good."

In *Jeremiah* i. 10, addressed to the Prophet by Jehovah, are these words:

"So I have constituted thee this day over nations and kingdoms, to root up, and to pull down, and to waste, and to destroy, and to build up, and to plant."

Now, would any man of common sense say, after having seen both those passages and the expressions of the bull, that the first and not the

second, was the text alluded to by the Pope? And what would any person say of the candour of the man who would publish that the Pope asserted that he was Jehovah, and not Jeremiah? Who constituted Jehovah prince? No person. The self-existent Deity was not constituted —he was prince by his own authority. But Jeremiah was constituted prince, and so forth. The Pope says he is constituted. The allusion is then plain. The words of the bull and words of the first chapter are identically the same. The allusion is then plainly to the first chapter, and not to the eighteenth. The first chapter is actually quoted in the original bull, not the eighteenth. What then can be thought of the man who, whether it be Dr. Barrow or "One of the People in the South," states that the allusion is to the text of the eighteenth chapter, and that the Pope assumes the place of Jehovah, when in fact the allusion is to the text of the first chapter, and the Pope assumes only the character of the prophet Jeremiah? This is what we call distinct, deliberate misrepresentation; it is an unbecoming trick, of which truth stands in no need, and of which a man having the least disposition to honesty, would be ashamed.

We shall, in our next, endeavour to conclude our examination of this topic. B. C.

SECTION V.

In our former numbers we have shown that the writer who assumed the signature of "One of the People in the South," failed in his attempts to prove that it was a doctrine of the Roman Catholic religion, that the Pope could dispense with the obligation of oaths, contracts, and agreements. We showed that the cases adduced by him did not come under the principle which he contended for; that they all had reference to oaths of allegiance, and that in the German cases the Popes had, by the law of nations, and by the special constitution of the German empire, a right to interfere; that in the English cases, though there was no strict right, according to the modern principles, there was a right of absolving from the oath according to the notions then entertained, by the concession of English kings, even of Henry VIII. himself, who received from the Pope a title of "Defender of the Faith," which his successors have retained, though they have been almost uniformly the persecutors of the faith which he then defended; which right was conceded and established by the consent of the ambassadors of the kings, in the temporal and civil regulations of several councils; and as by the then law of the realm, the crown of England was to go to the legitimate issue of

the king, and by the law of Christendom the See of Rome was to judge of the legitimacy, and by the decision of that See Elizabeth was illegitimate, and therefore not entitled to the throne. That in the case of Navarre, the king was not a lord paramount and independent, but a prince holding as a fief to a liege lord, to whom he was opposed, and at the request of whose prime ministers the Pope, according to the laws then in force, knowing the fact of rebellious oppositon which was alleged by the party of Guise, was bound to pronounce his subjects absolved from their oath to him who did not observe his oath to his liege lord.

Thus, we have seen that no one of these cases bears any analogy to the case of an American citizen, who owes no conditional allegiance to his state; whose government has conceded no right to any other power to interfere in its concerns; which has never been a party to those regulations; and which derives its right and authority from the will of the people, and the law of God giving the sanction to that will, freely and fully expressed by the regular organs of the nation.

But suppose the Popes did arrogate such a power unjustly to themselves in the cases of England and France. The people, who were Roman Catholic, did not acknowledge any right in the Popes to grant them such absolution. Yet those people held the Roman Catholic faith; therefore it is no doctrine of the Roman Catholic faith that the Pope could dispense with their oaths of allegiance.

Nor was this all: but suppose even the Popes did hold such a doctrine, we can gratify the writer by showing him the distinct act of the Pope disclaiming any such power, and the distinct statement, by six very high authorities, that so far from being part of the doctrine of the Roman Catholic religion, it is distinctly opposed to its spirit and practice.

This calumny against the Roman Catholic religion, like most of the others which are still maintained and cherished in America, originated in England, a country whose writers, under the semblance of history, have published more slanders against Roman Catholics and their religion, than all the other writers who ever stuffed falsehoods into their works in any other nation, or perhaps in all the other nations of the world. The whole weight of English authority, and the unrestrained genius of English invention, and distortion, and fallacy, had been let loose and excited against the Roman Catholic religion during two centuries; and from the nursery to the senate, wooden shoes and Popery were the theme of abuse. King-killing doctrines were charged upon them by the high tories, whilst the whigs cried out that they were the most pernicious jacobites, who held the doctrines of passive obedience and non-

resistance, and that they looked upon every king to be a god. Their destruction was sealed, and whatever party held the reins, they were certain of being ground under the wheels of the state, whilst they were misrepresented to the nation. The pulpit and the press, the courts, the parliaments, the ale-houses, all were employed in calumniating them; and the Roman Catholics had neither press nor pulpit to rebut the charges, and by dint of repetition even the framers of lies began to imagine what was re-echoed from so many quarters must be true.

Towards the end of the last century, it was found necessary, for political purposes, to mitigate the persecution; and to afford some plausible pretext, and to preserve some appearance of decency, and consistency, and reason. Mr. Pitt affected to think that Catholics might be spared a little, provided they really did not hold those doctrines which their predecessors held; but as their doctrine was unchangeable, he feared it was impossible for them to show that they did not hold the king-killing and deposing, and other such doctrines. The Catholics told him, their doctrines were unchangeable it was true, but their predecessors were calumniated,—they never held such doctrines; and they too were calumniated, neither they nor the other Roman Catholics held any such doctrines. The wily statesman appeared to be astonished,—and said, if their universities would testify that this imputed doctrine was no part of their creed, something might be done to relieve them.

By his directions, then, the following three questions were sent to the Universities of Paris, Douay, Louvain, Alcala, Salamanca, and Valladolid:

[These queries and the answers of the Universities have already been twice given, and hence omitted here. See Vol. II. Calumnies of Blanco White Letter 23.]

After having thus given the answers of those Catholic universities, we next give the decision of the late Pope Pius VI. The Roman Catholics in Ireland were permitted to swear allegiance to the king in 1772; but besides allegiance, there was a test of doctrine proposed to them: the form was submitted by the laity to the bishops, and subsequently was by them, together with their opinion thereupon, submitted to the Pope, Pius VI., after his accession to the pontificate, and it was solemnly approved of by the Cardinals, and sanctioned by the Pope, as containing the spirit and expression of Catholic faith. The following is an abstract thereof, in the form in which it has since then been sworn by the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland.

"I do swear that I do reject and detest as unchristian and impious to believe, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under the pretence of their being heretics; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics; I further declare that it is no article of my

faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any authority of the See of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatever." . . . "I do declare that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm; and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, and of his only son, Jesus Christ, my Redeemer, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or authority of the See of Rome, or any other person whatever; and without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning. So help me God."

The Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland published the answer of the Pope, and of the Sacred Congregation, declaring this to be consonant to what always was the Catholic doctrine, and declaring whatever was opposed thereto to be opposed to the Catholic faith. The bishops exhorted their flocks to take the oath, and they themselves set the example. Thus our friend in the South, who always likes to look at the bright side of the question, and who has so much respect for that church built on the rock of ages, will be gratified in finding his opinion to have been erroneous; and as becomes a man of candour and religion, raised to so respectable a situation as he holds, we doubt not he will as openly avow his mistake. We have given him historical inquiry, public documents, the decisions of the Pope and cardinals, of six universities, and the solemn oaths of thirty-two bishops and their successors, and the solemn oaths of millions, who have endured persecution rather than take an oath which they could not with a safe conscience take; and we humbly conceive this is better evidence than the misrepresentation of Doctor Barrow, who was an interested writer in the midst of the prejudices of a persecuting nation.

But lest this should not be sufficient, we shall lay before our friend in the South another document, which was drawn up by the Catholic committee in Dublin, and published by them on the 17th of March, 1792, after it had received the sanction of the archbishops and bishops of Ireland, and which was subsequently moulded into the form of an oath, and approved of by the Pope and cardinals as consonant to Catholic doctrine, and then taken generally by the archbishops, bishops, priests, and laity of Ireland.

"We, the Catholics of Ireland, in deference to the opinion of many respectable bodies and individuals among our Protestant brethren, do hereby, in the face of

our country, of all Europe, and before God, make this, our deliberate and solemn declaration. We abjure, disavow, and condemn the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever, may therefore be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any other persons. We hold such doctrine in detestation, as wicked and impious; and we declare, that we do not believe that either the Pope, with or without a general council, or any prelate or priest, or any ecclesiastical power whatsoever, can absolve the subjects of this kingdom, or any of them, from their allegience to his majesty King George III., who is, by authority of Parliament, the lawful king of this realm.

"2. We abjure, condemn, and detest as unchristian and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder, or destroy, or anywise injure any person whatsoever, for or under the pretence of being heretics; and we declare solemnly before God, that we believe no act in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by, or under the pretence or colour that it was done either for the good of the church, or in obedience to any ecclessiastical power whatsoever.

"3. We further declare, that we hold it as an unchristian and impious principle, that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics.' This doctrine we detest and reprobate, not only as contrary to our religion, but as destructive of morality, of society, and even of common honesty; and it is our firm belief, that an oath made to any person not of the Catholic religion, is equally binding as if it were made to any Catholic whatsoever.

"4. We have been charged with holding, as an article of our belief, that the Pope, with or without a general council, or that certain ecclesiastical powers, can acquit or absolve us before God from our oath of allegiance, or even from the just oaths or contracts entered into between man and man:

"Now we utterly renounce, abjure, and deny that we hold or maintain any such belief, as being contrary to the peace and happiness of society, inconsistent with morality, and above all, repugnant to the true spirit of the Catholic religion."

The declaration goes on to state several other calumnies, and to deny and to refute them. We would recommend to our friend in the South, and to all others who wish to form correct opinoions of the Roman Catholics, and of their religion, to read Catholic as well as Protestant writers; for without meaning any imputation personally upon those who differ from us in belief, we owe it to truth and to justice to state, that of upwards of one hundred authors of the several Protestant communions, which we have read upon the subject of the Catholic religion, we could not name three who have not been guilty of the most glaring misrepresentation; and no class of those writers have been so grossly erroneous in their statements as the English authors. Scarcely a single assertion of theirs concerning the doctrine of Catholics is correct; and they have done more to corrupt and to pervert church history than any other people that ever existed.

We would recommend to our friend in the South, the perusal of the following extract of a pastoral letter from a Roman Catholic bishop of Waterford, in Ireland, to his clergy. Besides showing them how

little connexion the Catholic religion has with politics, it exhibits that even where Catholics were persecuted by Protestants, their principles, like those of the first Christians, were those of peace, and not of rebellion:

"In all your proceedings, very reverend and dearly beloved brethren, avoid intermixing the politics of the world with the sublime and heavenly maxims of the Catholic religion; they have not the smallest connexion with each other: the one is spiritual, the other is temporal; the one regards the transitory things of this world, the other the eternal affairs of the world to come. As the Catholic faith is a religion preached to all nations, and to all people, so it is suitable to all climes and all forms of government, monarchies or republics, aristocracies or democracies. Despotic or popular governments are not the concerns of the Catholic faith; it may well suit a small sect to regulate its creed and form of worship, according to the shape and form of government of the limited boundaries where that sect arose, exists, and dies away. Not so the religion which the prophet foretold should extend from the rising to the setting sun, which has been propagated and promulgated from Peru to China, from the East to the West Indies, from pole to pole, teaching the same doctrine, administering the same sacraments, and offering up the adorable sacrifice of the Redeemer, wherever man is found or God adored. It is therefore called the Catholic or universal religion. It may well suit the laity of your respective districts to pursue their temporal concerns and their temporal politics, by such ways as appear to them fair, peaceable, and loyal; and their past conduct is a proof that they are incapable of pursuing them by any other means. If their conduct has always been loyal and peaceable, even in the worst of times; if even when religious penalties made them total strangers to their native land; if when the ruling party, with insolence in their looks, and oppression in their hands, ground them down, when some of the most powerful men in the nation declared in the senate, that they hoped to see the day when no Catholic would dare to speak to a Protestant with his hat on; when even the course of justice was perverted, and the channels of it dried up, according to the prejudices and party views of the judges who sat upon the bench, and were paid for the impartial administration of it, by taxes levied upon the oppressed sufferers; yet even in these provoking times, if the body of Catholics remained inflexibly attached to their religion and to their king, what have you to dread from their proceedings, when not only the judges are equitable and humane, but also a great part of these impolitic religious penalties are removed, and the rest of them in such a state of progress to be totally removed; that however a junto, for their own interested or other sinister views, may raise mobs to try to throw obstacles against the total repeal of them, yet all their efforts must be useless. The vast rock is already detached from the mountain's brow, and whoever opposes its descent and removal, must be crushed by his own rash endeavours. The Popery laws are on the eve of being extinguished for ever; and may no wicked hand ever again attempt to divide this land, by making religious distinctions a mark to divide, to disturb, to oppress it."

Does our friend in the South mean to create religious dissensions in America by exciting unfounded prejudices against the Roman Catholics? Does he regret the absence of division? Is he jealous of the recognition of the Roman Catholic by the Constitution? Would he draw here and wield that blood-stained sword which has spread such ruin through Europe? We trust those are not his views.

What have the Catholic bishops of this country done to render them objects of suspicion to the government? Do they swear temporal or civil obedience to the Pope? If they do not, where is the necessity of submitting to the jurists a question of the possibility of taking the two oaths of spiritual obedience to the Pope, and temporal obedience to the state? Neither is this objection new. It was raised in England, and it was there discussed, examined and proved to be but a play upon the prejudices of a people to whom the Pope had long been exhibited as the "raw head and bloody bones" to terrify aged children. It was examined in France, in Spain, in Portugal, in Ireland, in every part of Europe. In China and several parts of Asia, and in all those places which were as jealous of their temporal rights as America is, it was declared that it was by no means opposed to the civil allegiance due to the state; and the bishops, on the same day, usually swear the two oaths of temporal fealty to the state, and spiritual fealty to the Pope. The circumstance of his being a temporal prince makes no change in the circumstances, for it is not obedience to his temporal but to his spiritual authority which is promised. Jurists have already decided the case in every one of those countries which we have mentioned, and many of those jurists were not Roman Catholics, yet they all decided that a citizen of any state may take it, and also the oath of fealty to the state. Do the United States claim spiritual obedience from its citizens? No. They leave the people free to pay to whom they please any spiritual obedience they think proper; and the Tartar, the Turk, the Greek, the Russian may, by the spirit of the constitution, live here, and, provided they pay civil obedience to the state, be in spiritual submission to the Grand Lama, the Caliph, the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Synod of St. Petersburg; so may the Roman Catholic to the Pope. The conscience of each individual is to regulate his religion. The bishop of a Protestant church has just as little right to regulate it as has the bishop of a Catholic church; and may the people of this country be ever ready to resist any wicked attempt to divide this Union by making religious distinctions a pretext to disturb or to oppress any well-conducted citizen.

What does the oath say? 1. The person taking it promises obedience to the Pope as successor of St. Peter. St. Peter never was a temporal prince; the Apostle had supreme spiritual authority. It is then spiritual obedience he promises. 2. Next he promises that he will not consent to any plot to kill or maim the Pope; to this, as to all the following clauses of a similar description, is added *salvo meo ordine*; *saving my order*: this expressed *salvo* distinctly excepts if the Pope shall invade the territory to which that bishop belongs, for then the law of

nature and of nations requires the bishop to exhort his flock to oppose the unjust aggressor: and in cases of some Popes who, forgetting their duty, did join in unjust wars, the bishops did oppose them under this *salvo*, though they had taken this oath, and were considered as having done their duty. 3. Next he promises to keep the counsels secret; this too comes under the *salvo*; that is the counsels appertaining to the good of the religion, not prejudicial to the rights of states or individuals. 4. He promises that he will help to keep for the church the temporalities of the papacy; for it has always been considered a great benefit to have the head of the church independent of the temporal control of any state or sovereign, because it prevents jealousy of other nations, and undue influence by his own sovereign to this clause, however, the *salvo* too applies, for he is not required to arm or to excite to arms in its preservation. 5. That he will assist the legates or ambassadors of the church as far as he can, and they require. 6. That he will preserve the primacy and superiority of the Holy See. Every Roman Catholic believes it to be derived from divine institution, it is therefore his duty to preserve the institutions of God. The words *increase* and *advance* mean no more than that he shall not endeavour to diminish and lessen them by sinister interpretations. His own order requires the preservation of its own rights; to increase the power of that over himself unduly, would diminish his own, and hence the *salvo meo ordine* is here again in force. 7. That he will make known plots against the Pope. 8. That he will preserve the deposit of faith, and the discipline, and rules, and laws of the ancient church. 9. "That he will endeavour to follow after, and to argue against heresy and schism." This clause has been badly translated, with the evident intention of conveying a false impression to the mind. *Hereticos, and so forth persequar et impugnabo.* Mr. Ainsworth gives seven meanings for the verb *persequar*, and no one of them is *persecute*; the meaning here is *follow after*; and *impugnabo* means *assail by argument*; and *hereticos* has never been understood as meaning that the individuals were to be followed after, but the doctrines. Thus the meaning of this much-misrepresented phrase is nothing more than the very same which a Protestant bishop solemnly promises that he will *root out and contend against erroreous doctrines*; not meaning by the sword of persecution, but by the sword of the word. Thus the clause is quite innoxious. However, as it was liable to misconstruction, it was in the pontificate of Pius VI. regulated, that where the meaning was misrepresented the clause might be omitted; and no bishop in America has sworn it. The other clauses are not objected to.

We now assure the writer who has, we should hope unintentionally,

but grossly, misrepresented our religion, and we assure him in sincerity, in the words of a Secretary to the Catholic Board of Ireland, in his letter to a Protestant historian who misrepresented the acts of that body at the very time of their session, "although we profess the Roman Catholic religion, we would not be of that communion one single hour, were its tenets such as they are represented through that baneful prejudice so prevalent in Great Britain and Ireland, which proves an effectual drawback to the otherwise inevitable prosperity of the country. And we cannot sufficiently lament seeing unfounded calumnies so industriously circulated, as they only tend to keep alive prejudices which all liberal men reprobate as pestiferous to society."

We feel religion to be an important concern. We are convinced that no accident of birth or of education, that no antiquity or respectability of a church, can be a warrant for our rejecting the truth. We have been born of Roman Catholic parents, educated in the Roman Catholic religion. We find it to be venerable for its antiquity, the religion of the most enlightened nations, of the greatest empires, of the most powerful monarchs, of the most learned men, of the wisest statesmen, and the most enlightened philosophers, during a long succession of ages. All those circumstances weigh nothing with us in the examination which we have made. We have read and studied the tenets of those who have separated from that church, because from her every other Christian sect has mediately or immediately departed. We have weighed the alleged reasons for their separation. We have not taken their tenets, their reasons, their allegations from their adversaries, but from themselves: and thus we have made our decision. We respect the judgment of those who think differently from us. We freely concede to them, as we firmly demand for ourselves, the right to form the important decision in the choice of religious observance, with a solemn and awful responsibility to God alone. But whilst we shall have the opportunity of correcting mistakes of our friends, or the misrepresentation of our enemies, we shall do so with calm and undeviating perseverance, not by empty assertion, but by historical inquiry and the exhibition of facts.

At present we close our task; it remains with our fellow-Catholics to determine whether we shall resume it. Should no opportunity be afforded us, we must rest patiently content, to witness, as we have long done in silence, our religion reviled, and our tenets misrepresented, to a people who are anxious for the discovery of truth, but who are amused with fabrications—to a people who condemn us because they do not know us.

B. C.

ENGLISH ECCLESIASTICAL LAWS AND PRIVILEGES.

[This Essay upon the legal question of the origin and nature of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in temporal affairs, and of the rights and immunities of ecclesiastical persons, as these existed under the ancient laws of England, was occasioned by an accidental circumstance, foreign to their immediate subject. A writer in the *Boston Patriot*, it appears, made some remarks in that paper on the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England. These remarks, being copied into the *Miscellany*, met the eye of some zealous Episcopalian, who replied to the Protestant antagonist of his church by an attack on the See of Rome. In this he attempted to prove, that the crown of England, in taking to itself spiritual jurisdiction and supremacy, had simply resumed an authority over ecclesiastical persons and property in their civil relation, which the Pope had previously exercised unjustly, and by usurpation. To ward off the side-blow thus given, Bishop England wrote the following pieces, in which he commences giving the legal and historical proof of the fact, that the rights and privileges in question were part and parcel of the English Constitution. The original question, respecting the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England, is satisfactorily handled in a succinct manner in the first part of the essay; which was, unfortunately, left in an unfinished state. It is taken from the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, for 1827.]

SECTION I.

A subscriber to the *Miscellany* in Savannah has sent to us the Georgian newspaper, published in that city on the 7th inst., and drawn our attention to an article which it contains. This article purports to be a letter from "A Subscriber" to the editor of the *Georgian*, and the subscriber to the *Miscellany* calls for our notice of this article.

We always feel obliged to those friends who transmit to us those articles which they think it becomes our duty, as editors of a Catholic paper, to notice; but we must also reserve to ourselves the full and unqualified right of exercising our own judgment upon the propriety or necessity of adverting to the articles thus sent.

We do think it properly our duty to correct the errors of the correspondent of the *Georgian*. His letter commences with the following paragraph:

"*To the Editor of the Georgian.*

"*Sir*:—In your paper of Tuesday last, I observe an article copied from the *Boston Patriot*, containing some very unfair and erroneous statements in relation to the established Church of England and Ireland. Unfair and erroneous state-

ments can be made within a much smaller compass of words that will serve to correct and refute them. All I can hope, therefore, in relation to that article is, that you will indulge me in the publication of a few remarks upon some of the points which are most calculated to mislead the uninformed.''

The principle is then admitted, that if unfair or erroneous statements are made by a publisher, he ought to afford an opportunity for their correction. May we indulge the hope that the editor of the *Georgian* will, therefore, copy our remarks upon this letter?

The last paragraph of the letter is the following:

''After all, it may be inquired why any one in this country should evince so much interest in the vindication and defence of the Church of England; my answer is simply this. Besides my wish to see justice equally awarded to all,—there exists in this country a church nearly related to the Church of England, in its doctrines and mode of worship. Though these churches have no political connexion, yet they are frequently identified in character; and consequently every blow which, in this country, is aimed at the Church of England, falls more heavily upon her relative on this side of the Atlantic than upon herself. In this near relative of the Church of England, I do not hesitate to declare, I feel a deep and honest interest. To preserve unsullied the character of this offspring of that venerable establishment so unwarrantably assailed by the article to which I have attempted a reply, is my principle object in the remarks which I have here hastily thrown together. By giving to them the same publicity which you gave to the article from the *Boston Patriot*, you will oblige a SUBSCRIBER.''

Now, it is pretty obvious that the article of the *Boston Patriot* was not written by a Roman Catholic, nor intended to subserve the Roman Catholic religion. We have no recollection of the article, but we believe it will be admitted that it was not an attack by Catholics upon the Church of England, nor upon her near relative or dear daughter the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, which we freely acknowledge has no political connexion with the Church of England: of course, if the Puritan of New England ''unwarrantably assailed the character of this offspring of that venerable establishment,'' one would imagine that the retort be against that Puritan, and not against the Roman Catholic Church. Is it ''according equal justice to all,'' to assail those who, to say the least, were quiescent? But let us see the correctness and defence,—it proceeds thus:

''My first remarks are designed to explain and correct that writer's statement, respecting the constitution and officers of the Church of England and Ireland. He states that ''the King is considered the Head of the Church.'' In a certain sense this is true,—but in order rightly to understand the sense in which this assertion is to be admitted, a reference to some well-known historical facts will be necessary.

''Before the Reformation, in the sixteenth century, the Pope or Bishop of Rome had assumed and exercised the power of exempting from the civil jurisdiction of the kingdom all clergymen, ecclesiastics, and dependents upon the Church, residing in England; over all these the Pope, as head of the church, exercised

jurisdiction, by courts established under his authority in the kingdom. To such an extent had the jealousy of this pretended right advanced, that he would not allow a clergyman or ecclesiastic to be amenable to the civil authority, even for the blackest and most notorious of crimes. In the reformation of the church, this power of the Pope was resisted, and was thrown off; and the king was declared to be the head of the church, in such a sense, that clergymen, as well as laymen, should be subject to his authority, or in other words, should be amendable for their crimes and misdemeanors to the civil tribunals of the kingdom. This is the true meaning of head of the church, as applied to the King of England.

"It is true the king assumed and has constantly exercised some other powers, which, before the Reformation, had been exercised by the Pope,—such as the nomination of individuals to fill bishoprics becoming vacant by death or otherwise. But, though he nominates to those offices, he has not, nor did he ever pretend to have, authority to ordain or consecrate to the spiritual offices for which he nominates. It would be considered sacrilege by that very church of which he is called the head, for the king to exercise the spiritual functions of its ministers."

A writer who complains of unfair treatment ought not to be himself dishonest and uncandid; nor ought a writer who undertakes to correct the errors of others be himself a personification of gross ignorance. We know not who is the correspondent of the Georgian; but we assert, that if he believes his own statement of "historical facts" to be true, he is grossly deluded,—or if he is correctly informed, he is extremely dishonest.

1. It is untrue, that, in the sixteenth century, the Pope or Bishop of Rome had assumed or exercised the power of exempting any person who was a subject of the King of England from the civil jurisdiction of the king of the kingdom.

By the ancient laws of England, and not by the laws of the Pope, clergymen and the dependents of the church were amenable to particular courts held by authority of the constitution, and not the church; and which courts were established by virtue of charters and compacts with the supreme civil power of England, from which their jurisdiction was derived; just as the officers and dependents of barons were, by the feudal system, amenable to the court of those barons within the realm of England. Tyrants frequently sought to oppress the officers and servants of the church, as also those of the barons; but the courts of each, which were made the constitutional protectors as well as judges of the officers or dependents, interposed, and were on that account detested and reviled by those tyrants, and by their parasites. Those courts then existed not by Papal, but by constitutional creation; they were not Roman, but British institutions; their civil and criminal jurisdiction emanated from the charters of the British crown, not from the Papal bulls. In America we recognise, as an old principle of sound British constitutional law,

the validity of charters, the stability of chartered rights, the duty of all the members of the corporation, and protectors of a corporation to vindicate those rights, and their obligation to resist any tyrannical attempts which might be made by king, or by Pope, or by reformer, to violate the contract by which those rights were legally and constitutionally secured. Thus, the exemptions of the clergy were made by British charters, and not by Papal authority.

2. It is untrue, that the Pope, as head of the church, exercised civil authority in the realm of England, over all those exempt persons, by courts established by his authority in the kingdom.

No such court was established by the authority of the Pope, as head of the church. He neither had, nor claimed, nor exercised any civil jurisdiction within the realm.

3. It is untrue, that the Pope would not allow a clergyman or ecclesiastic to be amenable to the civil authority, even for the blackest and most notorious crimes.

The Pope, who was head of the church, was protector of its rights, whether original or acquired; and also was generally made arbiter of the differences which arose in feudal times between princes who entered into the great confederation of Christian Europe,—but this last was by concession, not as a consequence of his spiritual headship: so, too, he was frequently and indeed generally admitted as the arbiter between the contending parties, as to the true meaning and spirit of their written contracts: his tribunal formed a sort of chancery for the feudal body; and when, in like manner, kings and their subjects contended, the one for power and the other for liberty, he was the usual arbiter, as being independent of either, and most likely to give an impartial judgment: and in several instances, the stipulation of the contract specially designated him as the interpreter of its meaning, the arbiter of the differences, and the judge of the construction of the instrument. So it was in some of the charters by which ecclesiastical courts were invested with civil and criminal jurisdiction, as might be yet seen in several of the copies of the grants by which they were created. It became his duty frequently on this account, to interfere in the same manner that a court of chancery would at present, and he frequently decided against the tyrannical attempts of the king, or his officers, to violate the chartered rights of those courts to which, by the British law, the clergy and other dependents upon the church were amenable.

Be the policy of creating such courts good or bad, it matters not for the historical critic; the "historical fact" is all which it is his business to discover; and it is a fact that the Savannah subscriber to the

Georgian has either ignorantly or wittingly made, in one short paragraph, three egregious misstatements, highly injurious to the Roman Catholic religion. We shall also show that he is equally incorrect in his statement of the original meaning of *head of the church*, as applied to King Henry VIII., who first assumed the appellation in the statute which confirmed the title.

1. It is not true, that the meaning of the *king is the head of the church* was intended by King Henry VIII., who first assumed it, and his courtiers who first bestowed it, to be confined to asserting that clergymen, as well as laymen, should be amenable for their crimes and misdemeanors to the civil tribunals of the kingdom.

In November of the year 1534, the act (xxv. Henry VIII), was passed, declaring the King of England, his heirs and successors, should be taken and reputed the only supreme heads on earth of the Church of England,—with full power to visit, reform and correct all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts and enormities, which by any manner of spiritual authority ought to be reformed and corrected. Previously to this, viz., in 1529, the act which deprived the clergy of their immunities had passed, though unconstitutionally, and with the protest of the lower house of convocation, as may be seen in Collier, ii. *Records* xxviii. There was an act then passed in 1529, depriving the clergy of several of those immunities given to them by British, not by Papal law; and in 1534, that is five years afterwards, an act passed, making King Henry VIII., his heirs and successors, *heads of the church*, with, amongst a variety of others, the powers enumerated above. Thus, the true meaning of the king being head of the Church of England, is not that clergymen, as well as laymen, are subject and amenable to the civil tribunal; and in point of fact, the ecclesiastical courts do as yet exist, and the clergy still do possess nearly all the immunities not taken away by the act of xxi. Henry VIII. in 1529.

2. It is not true, that the King of England had, before the Reformation, the power and right to appoint to vacant bishopries.

In England this right and power was generally vested in the chapters, subject to the confirmation of the Pope. John and other tyrants, who sought to oppress the people by nominating their favourites to the bishopries, were foiled in their attempts by fraud and force, to obtain this power; and the principal disputes they had with Rome were caused by their violence in opposing bishops who, like Langton, taught the people the nature of their civil and political rights, and made the barons swear to vindicate their liberties against the despotism of the monarch. It was by bishops the barons were taught to obtain and to defend

the Magna Charta against the king, even when he sought the protection of the Pope against the bishops, and the barons, and the people. On this account the arbitrary kings of England and their sycophants hated and persecuted the bishops. But since, under the Reformation, the kings of England have attained the power of appointing obsequious men to the sees, the bishops give them no trouble; they are seldom found to be the advocates of popular rights and public liberties. In March, 1534, was passed the statute xxiv. Henry VIII., providing, that bishops should no longer be presented to the Pope for approbation; and the mockery of an election was substituted for its reality. Upon any vacancy of a see, the king was to send to the dean and chapter, or to the prior and monks, as the case might be, who in Catholic times had the full right of real election, his letters missive, or *conge d'elire*, giving them permission to proceed to the election, and requiring them within twelve days to return as duly elected the person whose name was therein contained, under the penalty of forfeiting their right of election for that time, and the choice would then devolve to the crown. The king would then signify the election to the archbishop, and grant his warrant for the consecration; this was before the act of headship In Ireland the mockery of election is dispensed with, and the appointment is made at once by letters patent.

3. Though the king, as head of the church, does not pretend to be a bishop, and thus to have power to consecrate bishops or to ordain priests, yet it is true that the bishops of that church did acknowledge that their spiritual commission was derived from the king *as head of the church*, though their spiritual character was derived from their ordination,—and they thus avowed the king to be the source of their spiritual jurisdiction, and in this sense they did acknowledge him to be the head of the church. The distinction is simple and intelligible. When a Protestant clergyman is ordained presbyter or priest, he has received his character by which he is qualified to do the duties of his office; but until he is appointed to a place, he has not jurisdiction or authority over any person as his spiritual teacher or guide: without meaning anything disrespectful, we shall compare it to the certificate of the Board of West Point, that a young gentleman is fitted or qualified to take a command or to hold a commission: let us suppose the law to be that no commission would be valid, except it was founded upon a certificate of qualification: he afterwards is commissioned in a particular regiment—his authority is derived from the commission, not from the certificate, because whilst he held only the certificate he had no authority; although, because of its possession, he was qualified for receiving author-

ity, yet that authority was bestowed upon him only by the commission itself. So, no person could be appointed to a spiritual charge unless he had been ordained; but his spiritual jurisdiction is derived from the appointment, his spiritual character of qualification is derived from the ordination.

Thus, by the statute xxv. Henry VIII., it was declared that a portion of the power of the regal head of the church was to visit, which was always an episcopal act, or at least that of a spiritual superior, and to correct errors and heresies, which are spiritual crimes, and all other such as may be reformed and corrected by spiritual authority. Henry appointed Thomas Cromwell his vicar-general, which is a spiritual officer. This vicar-general held visitations, which is the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction. The spiritual commissions of the bishops are superceded by the king, which is the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction; the said commissions are renewed to them as deputies of the king, who is the supreme head; the commissions specify the particular acts of spiritual power, viz., ordinations, the administration of sacraments, preaching, and so forth, which they are to use during the king's pleasure, and as his deputies, and to prove the power to be delegated, and not original. Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, acknowledges that it ceased with the life of the principal, and he renews his commission from the new head, Edward VI.; and yet the Savannah subscriber of the *Georgian* tells us, that the king was head of the church only in being equally king of the clergy and of the laity. But one other fact will complete the test. A number of priests were hanged during the reign of Elizabeth, for denying this supremacy, and were offered their lives if they would acknowledge her as head of the Church of England. They one and all acknowledged her to be the lawful Queen of England, and declared solemnly, that clergy and laity were alike amenable to the civil laws, now that the immunities had been by Parliament abolished; yet they were hanged for continuing to deny that she was head of the church.

In September, 1535, the king suspended during pleasure the powers of all the archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries within the realm; after the lapse of a month, the prelates presented a petition to be restored to the exercise of their authority; and a commission was issued to each bishop separately, authorizing him during the king's pleasure, and as the king's deputy, to ordain persons born within his diocess, and to do the other spiritual duties. Again, in February, 1547, Cranmer, upon the ground that his commission from Henry died with that monarch, petitioned and obtained a new commisssion to execute the functions

of archbishop under Edward, the then head of the church, as did other bishops. We shall stop here for the present.

SECTION II.

We have known that the subscriber to the Savannah *Georgian* did not state the fact correctly, when he wrote that the true meaning of *head of the church*, as applied to the King of England, was only that clergymen as well as laymen should be amenable for their crimes and misdemeanours to civil tribunals of the kingdom. We might, if further proof of our position were necessary, refer to the fact, that the Presbyterian clergy did not and do not claim exception from amenability to the civil tribunals of the kingdom, and yet they deny to the king the style and right of being *head of the church*, neither does any one of the thousand and one Protestant sects which England contains, besides her national church, admit that he is properly or lawfully head of the church, or claim an exception for the clergy from responsibility to the civil tribunals.

The letter-writer continues:

"As to the writer's account of the subordinate officers of that church so frightfully marshalled under the titles of archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, deans, canons, prebendaries, parsons, rectors, vicars and curates, I will say but little. The whole of this formidable catalogue may be comprehended under the three simple titles of bishop, priest, and deacon; all the rest being only significant of the situations in which these holy orders are exercised. The term *parson*, however, belongs to no particular rank, and is now seldom used in relation to ministers of the church of England, or other churches, except as a diminutive, like *pettifogger* applied to the members of another profession."

With all due submission to the learned correspondent of the *Georgian*, we would advise him to study a little longer before he undertakes to correct what he calls other people's "unfair or erroneous statements." *Parson* is not like *pettifogger*, a diminutive, or a name of contempt; but it is a name of honour and dignity; it is a legal term of beneficial prerogative and privilege. Every parish priest in Catholic times was by the British law, a corporation; and at present so is the parish minister; he and his predecessors and successors, are by law considered but as one undying corporation—or civil person; and he represents his entire parish; thus the *parson* has numberless valuable rights and privileges and honours, which belong to no other clergyman. The law knows him in his own right and original public character; but knows not his assistant or any other clergyman who has not a parsonage, except as aids to the *parson*, or principal. Without meaning disrespect to the American church, it does not contain in its whole aggregate so

important an individual as the English parson. The bishops and priests and deacons of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, are, one and all, salaried officers, dependent upon their vestries: in the eye of the law they are only private individuals; whereas the English Parson is a sole corporator, and a perfect corporation. No Protestant clergyman in America is entitled to the appellation; to call him parson, would be equivalent to a bitter mockery, indeed; not because he is greater than what the name signifies, but because he is not so great. The term *parson* does then, by law, belong to a particular rank, viz. Protestant parish priests, and in common use, it belongs also to them. In Ireland the law recognizes Roman Catholic parish priests, but only as public ministers of the Catholic religion, not as parsons by any means whatever.

The letter-writer continues:

"The writer proceeds to add, that 'the parsons, vicars, and curates, perform all the religious duties of the church, (and that) the rest of the Episcopal establishment are but clerical sinecurists.' This statement is so manifestly at variance with the truth, that no reply to it can be necessary. I proceed, therefore, to notice the account which succeeds, of the burden imposed by this establishment upon the people."

We beg leave to say that the statement so far from being at variance with the truth, is perfectly true; save so far as regards what are called the rites of confirmation and ordination, which if they may be considered religious, as distinguished from official duties, are the only ones performed by the bishops. In Catholic times the other church officers had other religious duties, but since the change in religion, they have not; for instance, the Catholic prebend, or canon had spiritual or religious duties to perform; we should like to know what is the spiritual or religious duty of a Protestant prebend; Protestant canonships are all mere sinecures.

His next paragraph is in the following words:

"The account is in these words: 'the annual expense of this splendid church establishment, embracing upwards of ten thousand persons, exceeds twenty-two millions of dollars, and this oppressive burden is borne by the people of Great Britain, (England I presume he means,) a portion of whom, the dissenters, pay about one-fifth part of the whole, to support a religion they do not profess, besides supporting their own clergy.' I shall show presently that the writer is incorrect in several of the statements contained in this paragraph; but for the present let the truth of the whole be admitted, and let us see how his startling aggregates will appear when they are divided, as they are in fact over the whole kingdom. England contains nearly twelve millions of inhabitants; and let these ten thousand ecclesiastics depending on 'this splendid church establishment,' be apportioned equally among the people, and what will be the result? Each clergyman will have nearly twelve hundred souls in charge: as many surely as any one parish minister can fully attend. It will be said, however, that a considerable proportion of this population are dissenters, and not under the parochial charge of the clergy of the established church.

This is true—but so are a considerable proportion of the clergy of the established church employed in other avocations than that of parish ministers, and this would leave the average charge of each parish minister nearly as numerous as I stated above. Hence, though ten thousand clergymen seem a great number, when viewed in the aggregate, yet, when equally apportioned among the population, it is found not to be larger than the amount of duties to be performed would require."

We shall leave to the letter-writer to reconcile, if he can, this paragraph with the last, in which he stated that it was manifestly untrue "that all the religious duties were performed by the parsons, vicars, and curates," and in this he tells us "that a considerable proportion of the established clergy are employed in other avocations than that of parish ministers;" for surely, even he will not deny, that with the exception made above, there are no other religious duties to be performed by the clergy of the Church of England, but the avocations which form the duties of parish ministers, viz. of parsons, of vicars, and of curates. We also beg leave to inform him, if he does not already know it, that he ought not to have made his dividend 12,000,000, nor even 6,000,000, nor probably even 4,000,000; because, certainly, not one-third of the people of England profess to belong to the national religion; after deducting upwards of one million of Roman Catholics, he will have to sum up the millions of Presbyterians, Independents, Quakers, Methodists, Unitarians, Baptists, and hundreds of other denominations which make that kingdom so variegated an exhibition of a cumbrous hierarchy and contradictory laity: his quotient would then dwindle to about 400 souls for each clergyman, and when we strike off from this diminished result the number of children who have not arrived to that age which would call for his care, we shall find the average to each clergyman small indeed. We do however say that some of the poorer parsons, the greater number of the vicars, and nearly all the curates have very laborious duties, but this arises from the existence of numerous rich clerical sinecures, which the letter-writer says is manifestly at variance with the truth. We shall only assert that no person who knows anything of the state of the English church will agree with him. Neither the bishops, nor the sinecures, nor the pluralists themselves have presumed to assert at home what the writer has had the hardihood to publish in Savannah; perhaps, however, he will be more cautious in future. If he wishes to ward off blows from the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, it is bad policy for him to defend the abuses of that of England, and to misrepresent Roman Catholic times. If the letter-writer is a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Savannah, he would have done better, by imitating the prudence and candour of his own pastor, whom we respect more highly,

and whose variance from our creed we regret more, because he is unlike those whom the letter-writer attempts to defend.

He continues:

"Let us now pursue the same method with the writer's gigantic aggregate of expense attending the support of 'this splendid church establishment.' It exceeds, he says, twenty-two millions of dollars. Admit this to be the fact; and let this sum be supposed to be equally divided among the ten thousand dependents on the church establishment; and what is the result? Each one would receive something like twenty-two hundred dollars a year; certainly no very extravagant sum for men who have the time, labour, and money required to prepare for the due and proper exercise of that profession. That it is not equally distributed is well known: but if this inequality of distribution be an evil, it is an evil incident to society in general, and as incurable in the church as elsewhere. To effect and preserve an equal distribution of property among all the members of a community, is what has never yet been done to any extent."

The only remark we shall make upon this, is, that as the number employed is disproportionately great, so is the expense; though no individual should receive more than enough for his support. No Roman Catholic establishment is half so great. His next position is most unfortunate for him.

"If, indeed, this revenue of twenty-two millions of dollars were, as this writer intimates, raised from the people, and distributed at discretion by the government, something like this equality of distribution might be effected. But his position is far from being true. A very great proportion of the incomes, especially of the bishops and other beneficed clergy, arise from estates, from time immemorial, appropriated or bequeathed for the support of the particular offices which they severally hold. See then the unjust view of the subject presented by this writer. He says, 'the receipts of the higher officers of this hierarchy are as extravagant in amount as the manner of raising them is onerous to the people. The annual income of the Archbishop, (meaning of Canterbury probably) is but little short of one hundred thousand dollars, and that of the bishops is about thirty-three thousand dollars each.' He would thus seem to insinuate, that a certain stipulated sum was paid by the government to the archbishops and bishops. But this is very far from being the fact. The revenue of the Archbishop of Canterbury arises from the income of estates, which are as really the property of that see, as the property held by any private gentleman in the kingdom is his own. And so of all the bishops in the kingdom, some receiving more and some less, according to the value and productive nature of the property attached to the diocesses which they severally fill. There is then no more hardship in the tenant's paying his rent to an archbishop, or a bishop whose title to the property rented is *ex officio*, than in his paying it to one whose title is in person, or in fee simple. Who then is oppressed by the fact, though the Archbishop should receive one hundred thousand dollars, and the bishops thirty-three thousand dollars each annually. So far is this from being a burden upon the people, that by it the people are relieved from the burden of supporting many of their clergy, as much as the people of any parish in this city would be relieved by a legacy or donation, the interest of which should for ever go towards the support of the minister, for the time being, of that parish."

In this "time immemorial" when those estates were appropriated or bequeathed, the people who gave them were Catholics, and they were given to support Catholic bishops and Catholic church officers to perform duties of the Roman Catholic Church. Upon what principle of justice or of equity then do the present incumbents, whilst they eat the bread of rapine, vote for the persecution of the plundered Catholics? It is true the Catholics state that they have relinquished the claim and transferred the property to the English nation; if then the claim to the estates is good because of the relinquishment, and the robbery of Henry, of Edward, and of Elizabeth, becomes thus legalized, the estates belong to the English nation, and the people of that nation have a right to complain if the national property be misapplied. Again, the donors and testators gave those estates for special purposes, viz. for the discharge of spiritual duties of the Roman Catholic Church, which the present incumbents are unwilling and unable to perform. By a decision of the Court of Equity of South Carolina upon appeal, it was solemnly and properly decided, not five years since, that the property left for the support of a Protestant Episcopal clergyman to perform the services of that church in a particular place, could not, even when such a clergyman could not be had, be applied to support, upon the principle of *cy pres*, a Presbyterian clergyman to perform his service. This is manifestly a correct decision, because the donor did not intend to give it for any purpose but for that which was by him specified, certainly not for a purpose contradictory to that which he expressed. Does the Savannah letter-writer imagine that the pious Catholics who gave the estates now enjoyed by the English Protestant clergy intended to give them to persons who not only would be unwilling and incapable, but who derided the performance of the prescribed religious duties for which they were given, who mocked the institutions which the donors venerated, denounced their church as idolatrous, proclaimed their legacies to be sinful superstitions by which these testators and donors sought to purchase pardon for their crimes; announced that in making those bequests and donations they insulted God and injured society, and who praised as servants of God the men who plundered their tombs and scattered their ashes. Does the Savannah letter-writer imagine that the pious donors of the estates intended they should be enjoyed by the present incumbents?

It is clear that by no stretch of legal ingenuity, could such an intention be attributed to the donors or testators. It is clear that the conditions upon which the property was to be enjoyed, are not fulfilled; if the Savannah letter-writer founds the title upon the donation, or bequest,

he must fail, since it was neither given to the parsons who hold it, nor for the purpose to which it is applied, and was given to be enjoyed, only upon conditions which are not fulfilled. Suppose it to be forfeited to the crown by seizure, by escheat, or by resignation, then it is public property, and applicable to public purposes, and the people have a right to complain if it is improperly thrown away, as the majority of the English people say it is at present.

But the gentleman has forgotten the tithes, and the stole-fees, and the surplice-fees, and the poundage, and marriage-fees, and all the *et ceteras*, every one of which must be paid by Catholics, and by dissenters, as well as by Church of England men: and he has forgotten that Roman Catholics are charged double land tax. All those are faults which are not imputable to the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. The good gentleman ought to have had more respect for Bishop Hobart, than to insinuate, that when he complained of the glaring faults and notorious abuses of the Church of England, and of its inferior piety, he intended the blow to fall more heavily upon that church of which he is so conspicuous an ornament; and whose superior piety and more pure discipline form the theme of his eulogy.

SECTION III.

The Savannah correspondent of the *Georgian* has thought proper to state that we "fulminated serious charges *ex cathedra* against him." We do not understand his allusion, unless it means that we charged him with gross ignorance upon the subject of which he has treated, or with knowledge and dishonesty. We shall, if he pleases, though we should hope he does not desire it, give him, as a third choice, "ignorance of his subject and dishonesty of intention;" but beyond this we do not feel ourselves warranted in going; nor did we wish at any time to pass so unfavourable a judgment upon him.

He tells the editor of the *Georgian*:

"A commercial paper is not the medium through which to present at length the proofs of historical facts. I shall, therefore, simply contradict the charges of falsehood or misstatement preferred against me in the numerical order in which they are arranged in the article from the *Miscellany*, and pledge myself to you, sir, to whom, if not to the conductors of that paper, I am known, for proof of what I affirm, whenever it may be asked through a proper medium, and with a spirit of friendly inquiry after truth."

That is, in plain terms, that he has made assertions, whose truth we have denied, and he will now in return deny the truth of our assertions, but will not give historical proof through a commercial paper; and be-

cause the editor of the *Georgian* know who he is, they must be satisfied that he is able to uphold the truth of his assertions. Really, with all due respect for the editors of the *Georgian*, we cannot see the logic of this conclusion. We should prefer his giving the proof itself. As he has not told us what medium he would choose as a proper one we know not whether he will consider our offer a fair one. We offer him the use of our columns; his proofs to be corrected by any person in this city, whom he may select, for the purpose of rebutting the arguments which we shall now adduce in support of our assertions.

The following are his "few words of rejoinder:"

"1. It is not untrue that the clergy of England did, in the 16th century, claim exemption from the civil or secular jurisdiction of the kingdom; and did found, and to some extent, establish this claim, not upon 'charters and compacts with the supreme civil power of England,' as the writer for the *Miscellany* asserts, but upon an alleged decree of the church, of which the Pope was then the acknowledged head.

"In my former article I did, indeed, use the word Pope, instead of the clergy of England, who were his dependents and representatives in the kingdom. But how far the spirit and obvious meaning of my former statement differs from the one now made, let the impartial reader judge. I merely ascribed to the head, what was actually executed by the members of the body.

"2. I did not assert that the Pope ever exercised civil authority in England. The denial of it, therefore, was perfectly gratuitous. But that the Pope, or, if the phrase is preferred, his clergy in England, did exercise an authority which was odious to the king and his subjects, and which they determined to abolish, I presume even the learned editors of the *Miscellany* will not deny. The extent to which this odious authority was stretched in one direction, is implied in my denial of the third charge preferred against me.

"3. It is not untrue that the Pope, or as I have explained, the clergy of England, a member of which he was the head, would not allow a clergyman or ecclesiastic to be amenable to the civil authority of the kingdom, for the blackest and most notorious crimes. Such criminal must first be arraigned before an ecclesiastical tribunal, ultimately depending upon the Pope, and not upon the King, for enforcing its jurisdiction, and amenable to the Pope and not to the king for the due and proper exercise of its authority. By this tribunal the person must be degraded or dismissed from office, before the king's authority was allowed to interfere. Or, at least, if jurisdiction were courteously allowed to the secular tribunal, the same exemption in fact was claimed by arrest of judgment after conviction, upon the plea of benefit of clergy, of which every tyro in the law, who has read Blackstone's *Commentaries*, knows the history and meaning. And if this claim of exemption was not always allowed, it was because the power of the church was not equal to her claims.

"So much for my 'three egregious misstatements, highly injurious to the Roman Catholic religion, either wittingly or ignorantly made in one short paragraph.'"

Before we proceed farther, we would request of the gentleman to enable us to reconcile the following assertions. "I did not assert that the Pope ever exercised civil authority in England." "It is not untrue

that the Pope would not allow a clergyman, or ecclesiastic to be amenable to the civil authority of the kingdom," because we conceive the absolute and unconditional prevention of amenability to a civil tribunal for a civil offence, to be an exercise of civil authority: we also believe that the courteous allowance of jurisdiction to a secular tribunal, implies a paramount or at least superior jurisdiction of a similar description in that person or body which exhibits its courtesy in making the grant, as it recognises in the granter a power of refusal which could leave the tribunal powerless.

We now proceed to exhibit evidence in support of our position: that the claims of exemption from ordinary courts, and the privileges of the British clergy, in civil matters, were founded upon the grants or charters of the British civil power, or upon compacts with that power. Indeed, to claim such exemptions from any other source, would be highly ridiculous; because the spiritual commission given by Christ to his church, regarded not civil authority: such authority was never claimed nor exercised by the Apostles.

The earliest laws which we find upon the subject are those of King Ethelbert, or Albert, who was converted by St. Augustin. This monarch ascended the throne of Kent in 561; he was the fourth descendant from Hengist, the Saxon, who was fifth in descent from Wodin, or Odin, the Scythian Asiatic conqueror of the north of Europe. Hengist and Horsa aided Vortigern, the British king, to repress the Picts, who invaded Britain upon its abandonment by the Romans; Hengist arrived in 449, and after the expulsion of the Picts, he received from Vortigern the territory of Kent; of which he became king in 457. His descendant, Ethelbert, reigned from 561 to 613, according to Bede, to 61, according to the Saxon Chronicle. Bede states amongst other things of this king, (lib. ii. chap. 5.)

Inter caetera bona quae genti suae consulendo conferebat, etiam decreta illi judiciorum juxta exempla Romanorum cum consilio sapientum constituit: quae conscripta Anglorum sermone hactenus habentur et observantur ab ea. In quibus primitus posuit, qualiter id emendare deberet qui aliquid rerum Ecclesiae, vel Episcopi, vel reliquorum ordinum, furto auferret; volens scilicet tuitionem eis quos et, quorum doctrinam susceperunt, praestare.

"Amongst other benefits which by counsel he conferred on his nation, he enacted with the advice of the wise-men, decrees of judgments therefor, according to the example of the Romans; which being written in the language of the English, are as yet preserved and observed by the nation. Amongst which he placed in the beginning, in what manner recompense ought to be made by him who stole any property of the church, or of the bishop, or of the other orders, being desirous to afford protection to those whose doctrine and persons had been received by them."

Bede lived within the same century, and his testimony establishes

the following points:—1. That those laws were not enacted by the ecclesiastical, but by the civil power, viz. by the king, with the advice of his written or wise-men, or parliament. 2. That they were not an adoption of Roman laws, which are not canon, but are civil law: but they were laws made by a sovereign power after the example of another sovereign power; and, 3. That they conferred certain privileges upon ecclesiastics.

Another observation might be worth the notice of a tyro in the law who has even read Blackstone; that the canon law as it regarded general discipline, was the same in all countries, just as the laws of Congress are the same in all our states; but the laws respecting ecclesiastical privileges and exemptions, varied in the various sovereignties, as our state laws vary from each other, and for the very same reason, viz., because they were the acts of different independent bodies, each having original jurisdiction of its own, and neither bound by the authority or precedent of the other. The general council which enacted the canon had not temporal or civil jurisdiction, but its spiritual jurisdiction was universal; no temporal sovereignty had spiritual power, but it had full temporal and civil jurisdiction, and was competent to bestow a privilege or to give an exemption to the clerical or any other portion of its subjects; and the spiritual superior charged those of the clergy who received such privilege or exemption, not to surrender this acquired right, nor to permit any infringement upon their charters. Thus the original source of the right was solely and exclusively in the temporal government; and very frequently the grant was not a mere gratuitous concession; it was more generally, as we shall hereafter see, a return made for a benefit, or upon a stipulation, and thus became, if possible, more binding than a charter, as it was a closer and more formal contract of commutation, founded upon justice.

Wilkins gives the first law of Ethelbirht, or Ethelbert, or Albert, as follows:—

Godes feoh 7 ciricean xii. gylde. Biscopes feoh xi. gylde. Preostes feoh ix. gylde. Diacones feoh vi. gylde. Clerices feoh iii. gylde. Ciric grith ii. gylde. Mynsteres frith ii. gylde.

The following is the Latin translation which accompanies the Saxon:

"Dei peculium et Ecclesiae duodecies emendetur; Episcopi, peculium undecies emendetur; sacerdotis peculium novies emendetur; Diaconi peculium sexies emendetur; clerici peculium ter emendetur. Ecclesiae pax bis emendetur; Monasterii pax bis emendetur."

This law enacts for an injury to the property of God, or of the Church, twelvefold restitution; for that to a bishop's, elevenfold; for a priest's, ninefold; for a deacon's, sixfold; for a minor clergyman's, three-

fold; and for violating the peace of a church or monastery, double fine.

XXII. Of the same king, regarding places of sepulture.

Gif man mannan ofslead oet openum graefe. xx. scill. forgelde, 7 on xl. nihta ealne leode forgelde.

"If any man shall slay another whilst the grave is open, he shall be fined twenty shillings over what is usual; and shall pay the whole fine within forty days."

It may not be amiss to state here the answer which the Pope Gregory the Great sent to St. Austin, when informed by him of the twelvefold restitution to the church—"As for restitution, God forbid the church should receive more than she lost."

This does not look like the enactment of the laws by the Pope, or at his request.

Withred reigned at Canterbury, in the end of that century and the beginning of the next, viz., from 691 to 725. In the fifth year of his reign, on the 6th of August, a parliament or Wittengemotte, was held at Berghamstede, in which, amongst others, the following laws were enacted.

"Ciricean freols dome. 7 Gafola. 7 man for Cying gebidde. 7 hine buton neadhaese heora willum weorthigen."

Latin translation: Ecclesia fruatur immunitate et tributis; et pro Rege preces fiant, et ille non coacte, sed sponte honoretur.

English: "Let the church have immunity and tribute; and let prayers be made for the king; and let him have honour not by compulsion, but willingly."

Ciricean mundbyrd sie L. scill. swa Cinges:

Latin: *Patrocinium ecclesiasticum sit L. solidi, uti, et Regis.*

English: "Let the church patronage be fifty shillings, as also that of the king."

The next law regulates that certain criminals ought to be excommunicated.

The subsequent law enacts banishment against aliens, and denounces excommunication against native Christians convicted of concubinage.

The next law enacts that if after this gemot, any village prefect should despise the precept of the king and of the bishop and of the book of the law, by committing illegal concubinage, he should, according to the ancient laws, pay a fine of one hundred shillings.

A number of similar laws were passed in this same Wittengemotte, and any person at all acquainted with the history of the period must be aware that by virtue of the law of the land, not of the canon law, the bishop was, by virtue of his landed tenure, a presiding judge in the court at those trials, whether the accused was a clergyman or a layman.

The 17th law of this parliament enacted.

Biscopes word 7, Cyninges sie unlaegne buton athe.

That is—

"Let the word of the bishop, and of the king, be considered inviolable and firm without an oath."

This privilege was from the civil power, not from the canon law.

The 18th law regulated the mode of swearing or purging the superior of a monastery, a priest and a deacon; the 19th regulated for clergymen in minor orders; the 20th for strangers; the 21st for tillers of the soil; the 22d is the following:

Danna is cirican canne riht. Gif man Biscopes esne tihte oththe Cyninges, caenne hine an gerefan hand. Oththe hine gerefa clensie; oththe sell to swinganne.

"The right of ecclesiastical inquiry exists; when any man accuses the servant of the bishop or of the king; let him deliver him to the hand of the presiding officer; the presiding officer will acquit him, or deliver him to be punished."

This looks very like a grant of criminal jurisdiction by the civil power, viz., king Whitred and his gemot before the year 700. The two next laws regulate the tribunals and mode of trial for the subjects of monasteries, and in mixed cases where the parties are, one the subject of an ecclesiastical, and the other of a lay jurisdiction.

After the 29 authentic acts of this gemot; Wilkins adds from the MSS. *Roffensis*, or of the Church of Rochester, eleven others, but they are not so manifestly and unquestionably acts of this reign, though very ancient and of admitted validity; they merely regulate the difference of fines for various frauds or injustices committed upon ecclesiastics and in holy places; they proceed upon the same principle as the laws of Ethelbert, though somewhat modified.

Mr. Rapin, who used his best efforts in a variety of ways, to give to English history the aspect most unfavourable to the Roman Catholic Church, writing of the gemot of Berghamstede, which he places in 697, is anxious to make it appear to have been an ecclesiastical synod, because it was composed of clergy and laity. But the British Parliament, which is not an ecclesiastical synod, but a civil legislature, is at this day composed of clergy and laity. The form of its acts is, "Be it enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and the Commons, and so forth." The object of the persons, who call this and such like assemblies, synods, is to show the king presiding in his own right in such assemblies, and thus to found an early claim for his church-headship. But in the very same page, Rapin gives us an account of a national synod held in 747, at Cloveshoo, at which Ethelbald, King of Mercia, and several lords were present, but Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, was President; and having read Pope Zachary's letter, a body of 28 canons was drawn up concerning ecclesiastical discipline. In the same page he also informs us that Gregory and Theophylact presided as papal

legates in the synod of Calcuith in 785, or 787, which enacted several ecclesiastical ordinances. In the preceding page, Mr. Rapin informs us of a national synod at Hertford in 673, at which Theodorus, Archbishop of Canterbury, presided, and at which some canons of local discipline were enacted: but he does not like to admit the statement of Baronius, that this synod was convened by the Pope's order, and that Theodorus was a legate: yet he has no objection to allow in the same page, for the evidence is too clear, that in 680 the same Theodorus assembled a synod at Hatfield, at the request of the Pope, at which the British church received the decisions of the first five general councils, and that of a synod held just before at Rome, in which the heresy of the Monothelites was condemned.

Mr. Rapin, after mentioning a synod at Becanceld, at which Withred, King of Kent, presided, and a charter therein made, by which privileges were granted to the church, states that many persons have called its genuineness in question. Archbishop Wake wrote against its authenticity: of this synod and its acts we take no notice; but the historian acknowledges the genuineness of that of Berghamstede, and though he attempts to make it appear to be an ecclesiastical synod, he acknowledges the grant of privileges and jurisdiction made to the church in some civil and all criminal cases of the clergy, and concludes after a partial enumeration: "Thus by degrees the clergy obtained their privileges which they have but too often abused." We must come to one of two conclusions here: either this assembly of Berghamstede was an ecclesiastical synod, and the assumption of those privileges and immunities was an usurpation to which no resistance was made, but to which there was an immediate and ready acquiescence by the king and the laity, which is a most extraordinary supposition; or what is more natural to believe, the assembly was a regular, civil, legislative council which had power to make the grant, and its concession was recognised and acted upon without difficulty, and thus the privileges and immunities of the clergy originated in a perfectly legal and valid mode, viz., a grant made by the supreme temporal power of the nation.

We now proceed to show that the assembly at Berghamstede was not an ecclesiastical synod, but was a temporal legislature.

In the first place we find the synods of Calcuith, Hertford, and so forth, enumerated in the lists of councils, and their canons exhibited; they were held before and after the assemblies of Becanceld and Berghamstede, which are not found upon the lists of synods in church records. Thus they are not recognised by the church. Next, we find the

regular ecclesiastical superior of a council presiding in those recognised; but not so in that of those which we reject.

But ecclesiastics as well as lay persons, it is said, are found in those where the king presided. We answer: that as the lords spiritual are still members of the temporal legislature, so they were then, and were only found in their proper places, to which their lands entitled them as thanes.

Our positive evidence is the very title of the assembly, and the preamble to the enactments. Should any person desire to see the original Saxon, together with the Latin translation, he will find it in Wilkins. We give here the English:

"In the fifth year of the reign of the most meek ruler of Kent, King Withred, in the 9th indiction on the sixth day of August, in the place called Berghamsted, was assembled a council of the best chieftains. There were Brithwald, Archbishop of Britain, with the forementioned king, also the Bishop of Rochester, whom all style Gibmund, and he worthy, and all the dignities of the ecclesiastical order spoke unanimously, together with the people subject to their charge.

"There those chieftains, with the assent of all persons, made those judgments, and added them to the just institutes of the Kentish people, as here followeth, and is said."

The facts here stated are, 1. That a council of the best chieftains was assembled; this is the title uniformly given to the members of the Wittengemotte. 2. We find the names of only two bishops, but there were other ecclesiastical dignitaries; however, it is clear that they were not the only persons who made the judgments, for they were only of the same opinion with the people of other orders who were present. 3. We find the enactment to be by the judgment of the chieftains, generally and principally lay thanes, with the assent of all others, which was the usual mode of enacting laws, but not the mode of enacting canons. 4. The decrees are ordered to be entered amongst the temporal laws, viz., the just institutes of the Kentish people, not in the canons of the clergy. 5. The nature of several of the enactments is such as could be passed only by the Wittengemotte, and never could even come under the consideration of an ecclesiastical synod. Hence we conclude that before the year 700, the privileges and immunities of the clergy were created and granted by the civil power in the kingdom of Kent. We shall pursue the subject.

SECTION IV.

We have shown the origin of ecclesiastical immunities and privi-

leges to have been, in Kent, the civil law of the kingdom. We now proceed to show that amongst the West Saxons the case was similar.

Ina began his reign over the West Saxons or Wessex, in 688, and reigned thirty-eight years. The preface to his laws states that his enactments were made *mid getheahte 7 mid lere Cenredes mines fœder, 7 Hedes mines Biscopes, 7 Eorkenwoldes mines Biscopes, 7 mid eallm minum ealdormanum, 7 tham yldestan witum minre theode, 7 eac mycelre gesomnunge Goddes dheora.* "With the advice and learning of Cenred my father, and Hedda my bishop, (of Winchester,) and Eorkenwold my bishop, (of London,) and with all my aldermen, and the wise men of my people, and with a large assemblage of the ministers of God."

Rapin states that in the same year that Ina was crowned, he was declared monarch of all the Anglo-Saxons, in a general assembly. He also informs us that he published a body of laws which served for the foundation to that published in the next century by Alfred the Great, one of his successors.

The third of those laws regulates fines or corporal punishment for violating the sanctity of the Sunday.

4th. That church dues be paid before the feast of St. Martin, under a heavy penalty.

5th. Establishes the privilege of sanctuary under certain modifications, for those who fly to the church.

13. Enacts a heavy fine for giving false testimony before the bishop.

The entire number of acts at this assembly was seventy-seven.

Alfred the Great, father of the liberty and safety of the subject, ascended the throne in 872. The portion of his laws which has come down to us is evidently incomplete, but authentic. The institution of privy councils is attributed to him, as well as that of juries.

The 38th law enacts the payment of tithes and first fruits.

After the 49th. The recital is made of Christianity, of its having been received in England, and of several laws having been enacted to punish crimes; he proceeds to state that, having collected those together, he, with the advice of his witend getheahte, preserves and confirms those which they thought useful, and abrogates the rest, and then an enumeration is made under a new head.

In the 2d he enacts, which certain restrictions, the law of sanctuary for criminals who fly to the church.

In the 3d the penalties are regulated for violating the bail given to the king, to an archbishop, to a bishop, or to an alderman.

In the 5th, regulations are again further made concerning sanctuary and other church privileges.

The 6th fixes the penalty of sacrilege.

The 7th regulates the penalties for violation of cloister, or bringing a nun from a church.

The 18th enacts penalties against those who attempt to seduce nuns.

The 20th enacts that whosoever lends money to a monk without the leave of his superior, shall lose what he hast lent.

The 21st regulates the manner in which a bishop shall proceed to the degradation and punishment of a criminal priest.

It would be extremely tedious, and probably uninteresting, to enter farther into the detail of his enactments or of the other Anglo-Saxon kings. We have them lying before us, and shall, if necessary, publish them; but we are under the impression that what we have produced is fully sufficient to establish our proposition: "That the ecclesiastical privileges and immunities, and jurisdiction of ecclesiastical tribunals in civil or criminal cases in England, originated from the grants of the civil power, and not from the canon law of the Roman Catholic church." We shall conclude this examination of the early Anglo-Saxon laws upon the subject, with the following extract from that excellent work of the accurate Lingard, taken from his third chapter of the *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. In our next we shall examine the laws of the Norman English.

"It is a maxim of natural equity, consecrated by the uniform practice of the wisest as well as the most illiterate nations, that the man whose life is devoted to the service, should be supported at the expense of the public. As the ministers of religion are engaged in exercise of functions the most beneficial to society, they may with justice claim a provision, which shall be sufficient to remove the terrors of poverty, and permit a close attention to the discharge of their duties; but the manner in which this provision should be secured, is a subject of political discussion, and has always varied according to the exigence of circumstances, the manners of the people, and the method of public instruction. The present chapter will attempt to investigate the principal sources, from which the support of the Anglo-Saxon clergy was originally derived. The civil and religious revolutions of more than ten centuries have occasioned many important alterations: yet the more lucrative of the ancient institutions are still permitted to exist. Though the zeal of the first reformers execrated the doctrines, it was not hostile to the emoluments of popery: and their successors are still willing to owe their bread to the liberality of their Catholic ancestors.

"I. As donations of land were the usual reward with which the Saxon princes repaid the services of their followers, they naturally adopted the same method of providing for the wants of their teachers; and in every kingdom of the heptarchy some of the choicest manors belonging to the crown were separated from its domain, and irrevocably allotted to the church. Ethelbert of Kent, as he was the first of

royal proselytes, stands the foremost in the catalogue of royal benefactors. He withdrew his court from Canterbury to Reculver, and bestowed on the missionaries the former city and its dependencies: with proportionate munificence he founded the Episcopal see of Rochester; and as soon as Sabert, king of Essex, had received the sacred rite of baptism, assigned in conjunction with that prince an ample territory for the support of the Bishop Mellitus and of his clergy.[18] The other Saxon monarchs were emulous to equal the merit of Ethelbert; and the fame of their liberality has been transmitted to posterity by the gratitude of the ecclesiastical historians. Kinegils of Wessex gave the city of Dorchester to his teacher Birinus; and from his son and successor, Coinwalch, the church of Winchester received a grant of all the lands within the distance of seven miles from the walls of that capital.[19] The Isle of Selsey, containing eighty-seven hides, together with two hundred and fifty slaves, was bestowed by Edilwalch of Sussex, on the missionary of St. Wilfrid;[20] and the wealth of the ancient Northumbrian prelates sufficiently attests the munificence of Oswald and his successors. Nor were the Episcopal churches the sole objects of their liberality. In proportion to the diffusion of Christianity, parishes were established, and monasteries erected. In every parish a certain portion of glebe land was assigned towards the maintenance of the incumbent; and each monastery possessed estates proportionate to the number of its inhabitants. As landed property was the great source of civil distinction among our ancestors, the principal of the clergy were thus raised to an equality with the temporal thanes, admitted into the great council of the nation, and vested with an authority, which rendered them respectable even in the eyes of those who still adhered to the religion of their forefathers.

"The piety of the converts was seldom content with the mere donation of their property: and the value of the present was generally enhanced by the immunities which they annexed to it. The tenure of lands among the Anglo-Saxons had been established on nearly the same principles as in the other northern nations: and each estate subjected its proprietor to the performance of several duties to his superior lord. But most of the clerical and monastic possessions were soon discharged from every servile and unnecessary obligation.[21] By a transition easy to the human mind, they were considered as the property not of man but of God; and to burthen them with the services which vassals were compelled to render to their superiors, was deemed a profanation and a sacrilege. A just distinction, however, was drawn between the claims of individuals and those of the public: and while the former was cheerfully abandoned, the latter was strictly exacted from the ecclesiastical no less than the lay proprietor. To repair the roads and bridges, to contribute towards the maintenance of the fortifications, and to furnish an equitable proportion of troops in the time of war, were services so essential to the national prosperity, that from them no exemption could be granted. Such was the solemn declaration of Ethelbald, king of Mercia:[22] but other princes were not always guided by the same policy, and unless some charters of ancient date have been fabricated in more modern times, we must believe that several monasteries were emancipated from every species

[18] Bed. l. i. chap. 33, l. ii. chap. 3. Monast. vol. i. p. 18. Aug. Sac. vol. i. p. 333.
[19] Ang. Sac. vol. i. p. 190, 288.
[20] Bed. l. iv. chap. 13.
[21] Wilk. p. 57, 60.
[22] Wilk. p. 100. Spel. p. 527. Lel. Collect. vol. ii. p. 54.

of secular service, and permitted to enjoy the protection, without contributing to the exigencies of the state.[23]

"In addition to these immunities, others equally honourable in themselves, and more beneficial to the public, were enjoyed by the principal of the clerical and monastic bodies. The king, who erected a church or monastery, was urged by devotion, sometimes perhaps by vanity, to display his munificence: and the distinctions, which he lavished on its inhabitants, seemed to reflect a lustre on the reputation of their founder. The superior was frequently invested by the partiality of his benefactor, with the civil and criminal jurisdiction: and throughout the domain annexed to his church, he exercised the right of raising tolls on the transport of merchandise, of levying fines for breaches of the peace, of deciding civil suits and of trying offenders within his courts.[24] These important privileges at the same time improved his finances, and peopled his estates. The authority of the clerical was exercised with more moderation than that of the secular thanes: men quickly learned to prefer the equity of their judgments to the hasty decisions of warlike and ignorant nobles; and the prospect of tranquillity and justice encouraged artificers and merchants to settle under their protection. Thus, while the lay proprietors reigned in solitary grandeur over their wide but unfruitful domains, the lands of the clergy were cultivated and improved; their villages were crowded with inhabitants; and the foundations were laid of several among the principal cities in England.

"That spirit of liberality which distinguished the first converts, was inherited by many of their descendants. In every age of the Saxon dynasty we may observe numerous additions made to the original donations: and the records of different churches have carefully preserved the names and motives of their benefactors. On many the great object was to support the ministers of religion and by supporting them to contribute to the service of the Almighty. Others were desirous to relieve the distresses of their indigent brethren; and with this view they confided their charities to the distribution of the clergy, the legitimate guardians of the patrimony of the poor.[25] A numerous class was composed of thanes, who had acquired opulence by a course of successful crimes, and had deferred the duty of restitution, till the victims of their injustice had disappeared. These were frequently induced, towards the decline of life, to confer, as a tardy atonement, some part of their property on the church: and when they had neglected it, their neglect was generally compensated by the pious diligence of their children and descendants.[26] To these motives may be added the want of heirs, the hope of obtaining spiritual aid from the prayers of the clergy, gratitude for the protection which the church always offered to the unfortunate, and a wish to defeat the rapacity of a powerful adversary; all of which contributed in a greater or less degree to augment the possessions of the ecclesiastics. Had the revenue arising from these different sources been abandoned to the judgment or caprice of the incumbents, it might frequently have been abused; and the abuse would probably have relaxed the zeal of their benefactors. But this evil had been foreseen, and in some measure prevented by the wisdom of Gregory the Great. According to a constituiton, which that pontiff sent to the missionaries, the

[23] See the *Charters of Ina*, Wilk. p. 80, of Witlaff, *Ibid.* p. 177, of Bertluf, *Ibid.* p. 183, and of Edward the Confessor, *Ibid.* p. 318.

[24] Gale, p. 318, 320, 323, 490, 512. Wilk. p. 80, 177, 256.

[25] Wilk. p. 19, 102, v. 228, lv. lvi.

[26] This is the meaning of the terms which so frequently occur in the ancient charters, *pro remedio, salute, redemptione animae meae et priorum, antecessorum meorum.*

general stock was divided into four equal portions.[27] Of these, one was allotted to the bishop for the support of his dignity; another was reserved for the maintenance of the clergy; a third furnished the repairs of the church and the ornaments of religious worship; and the last was devoted to the duties of charity and hospitality. It formed a sacred fund, to which every man who suffered under the pressure of want or infirmity was exhorted to apply, without the fear of infamy or the danger of a repulse."

SECTION V.

In order to understand the meaning of the laws enacted by the Norman kings of England, we must look to those of Edward the Confessor. I shall make use of the copy given by Spelman and Wilkins, under the following title: *Leges boni Regis Edovardi, quas Gulielmus Bastardus postea confirmavit. "The Laws of the good King Edward which William the Bastard (William I. the Conqueror) afterwards confirmed."*

The first section states that, after the conquest of England, William, in the fourth year of his reign, by the advice of his barons, summoned from every county in England the English nobles, wise persons, and those learned in the law, to ascertain from them their laws, rights, and usages; twelve men from each county were sent, who were sworn to testify truly as to the laws in force, which of course were at that time those of Edward the Confessor.

The second clause relates to the privileges of the clergy and of scholars, which were both the same, for the law protected learning and religion equally.

The fourth stated that in the king's courts, any cause belonging to the church should have precedence of all others.

The fifth declared that tenants of the church and dwellers on its lands should not be impleaded out of the ecclesiastical court, even by an action for damage, unless that court shall refuse to do justice.

The sixth declared the existence and extent of the privilege of sanctuary.

The seventh declared that persons who for outrage were amenable to the bishop, and fled from sentence, or committed contempt of the court, should be taken for punishment before the king, and if within a certain time they did not appear, the king was to declare them outlaws.

The subsequent clauses relate to church dues, and so forth—after which the laws regarding other subjects are enumerated.

[27] Bed. l. i. c. 27.

Selden states that William at first preferred the laws of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Deira, but that upon the petition of the English people, the laws of the Confessor were restored and confirmed; and thus we perceive that those laws, to the observance of which the people submitted, and which the king, for himself and his successors, confirmed and gave in charge for execution, were as it were the charter of the English nation, and the kings were sworn to the observance and execution of the laws and customs, and of the defence and protection of those rights to the church. It would extend our observations too far to enter now into more special details, and a more lengthened history: we shall merely observe that it was part of the duty of the British bishops to defend the privileges and rights which they constitutionally possessed, against any illegal encroachment, whether made by the king, or by the Pope, or by any other person or power. The king of England had not despotic authority; but the Conqueror and his associates were accustomed to the feudal institutions of the continent, and he was impatient of the restraints under which he was placed by the customs and laws of England, and after the promulgation of those laws, he did by violence make serious inroads upon the rights of the church and of the people; so did his successors: and the resistance which was given by the bishops and the barons was a constitutional, and proper, and meritorious exertion on their parts to restrain the despotism of tyrants. Henry II, who was an able and persevering despot, made more important encroachments than did any of his predecessors upon the privileges of the church; but he was at length obliged to desist, after the murder of the Archbishop of Canterbury, by the royal parasites.

When Langton, the patriot, who taught the barons their rights, had succeeded to the see which Becket had so well filled, this archbishop found that the tyrant John was about to prostrate every barrier against regal rapacity and arbitrary rule. He then, together with the chief justice, Peters, explained to them the necessity of having the exact demarcation of their rights made anew, he told them of the sworn obligation of the monarch to govern by the constitution, and that was the charter of Edward's laws. Thus, the united bishops and barons at Runnymede, when they compelled John to sign the Great Charter, only did what they had a constitutional right to do. When John, in the first clause of that charter, confirms and grants that the English church shall be free, and have her entire rights and her liberties uninjured, he only pledged himself anew to what he swore at his coronation. When by his intrigues he procured the subsequent interference of the Pope, to induce those who had obtained his signature to this charter to relinquish their

rights to the tender mercies of John, the archbishop paid no regard to this attempt of the Pope, for his rights and those of his clergy were founded upon and derived from the law of England, and not the canon law.

We may now call upon the correspondent of the *Georgian* for his canon law upon the subject, since we may claim to have at least made out a *prima facie* case for our proposition, "that the privileges of the English church, and its power of civil and criminal jurisdiction, were derived from the temporal government of England, and not from the canon law of the church."

From what has been here shown, it is manifest that the writer, who identified the Pope with the English clergy, as respected the civil privileges of the English church, either was ignorant of the facts of the case, or desired to misrepresent them. The Pope was the head of the church in its spiritual concerns; he had no authority to confer or to withdraw civil privileges or criminal jurisdiction.

It will also be seen that what the correspondent of the *Georgian* styles the "exercise of an authority which was odious to the king and his subjects, and which they determined to abolish," was only the exercise of a constitutional right, which is always odious to tyrants, and which they would abolish if they could; but it is untrue that the people desired its abolition: on the contrary, they desired its continuance; and one of the chief reasons why the kings and some of their favourite barons desired its abolition, was because by its exercise the subjects were frequently protected from their injustice and oppression. We do regret to find any advocate of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these states, endeavour to identify its cause with that of the most tyrannical of the English monarchs: by so doing they give a sort of religious sanction to the usurpations of those men, and weaken the great principles upon which the foundations of our republics are based; neither does that church need this injudicious attempt to justify those usurpations.

The editors of the *Miscellany* would prefer meeting explicit statements, to answering undefined charges against what the correspondent of the *Georgian* is pleased to call "this odious power."

As for the third not untrue of the gentleman, it will be easily seen that the Pope had no jurisdiction whatever in those English ecclesiastical courts; they were altogether national, and merely national institutions. The enforcement of the law by the tribunal was a matter with which the Pope had no concern. If justice was denied, the case was removable to the King's Bench; but if justice was not denied, the original jurisdiction of the court was untouched. It is therefore notoriously untrue

to assert "that the ecclesiastical tribunal ultimately depended upon the Pope, and not upon the king, for enforcing its jurisdiction, and was amenable to the Pope, and not to the king, for the due and proper exercise of its authority." We would advise the gentleman to study a little more closely the British history of law, to look a little more deeply into the ancient authors, and not to be satisfied with what a tyro can collect from Judge Blackstone, and he will then perceive that he has made not only three, but three times three egregious blunders.

We now call upon him for the decree of the Catholic Church, under which he alleges the English ecclesiastical courts claimed their civil and criminal jurisdiction within the realm of England.

THE MORAL CHARACTER OF SEVERAL POPES

In Reply to a Writer in Washington.

[The occasion of the controversy on the moral character of the Sovereign Pontiffs was as follows.—Some person reported in the columns of a newspaper in Washington, D. C., a sermon preached by an Unitarian clergyman at the dedication of a church, in which were some rather uncouth aspersions upon the Catholic religion. Dr. England, under the signature of "Curiosity," noticed the sermon as reported, in the subjoined article, which appeared in the Fourth Number of the First Volume of the *Catholic Miscellany*, for June 26th, 1822, under the title of Reformation.]

REFORMATION.

Our friend "Curiosity," has placed our pen under an injunction; he will not allow us to answer him. We have, however, moved the chancellor of common sense to have the injunction dissolved; for this dissolution we have shown cause, "inasmuch as the said injunction if continued in force would frequently cause the violation of a solemn contract which was made by us with the public, to wit: that we would give to them the said public good and sufficient information upon several subjects, concerning which the said "Curiosity" is very inquisitive. And forasmuch as the said injunction, if continued in force, might subject us to perpetual silence, inasmuch as the aforesaid "Curiosity" might write upon any subject, and forbid us to answer upon any." Which perpetual silence would be more difficult than Ithuriel's[28] perpetual celibacy; but though the chancellor was graciously pleased to dissolve the injunction and leave us at liberty, we will be moderate, to prove our claim to indulgence, and not this day remark upon the subject of these two letters:

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 19, 1822.

To the Editor of the Catholic Miscellany.

Sir:—I have lately read in the Washington papers, the account of the dedication of a building to the service of the one living and true God: that is, in plain English, the dedication of an Unitarian church.

[28] *Nom de guerre* of some writer in a newspaper.

The following is the outline of the discourse delivered on the occasion by the preacher, as I find it in the papers:

"To speak of the discourse of the Rev. Mr. Little as it deserves, would not fail to be accounted flattery; the prominent features of it were calculated to show that the Christian religion, like the Jewish in the days of Hezekiah, had been grossly corrupted and perverted in almost all respects:—the objects of divine worship had been greatly multiplied:—the idea of one holy, just, and good God, almost obliterated from the Christian world:—and a system of corrupt priestly government, where every crime might have been commuted for wealth, substituted instead of the divine morality taught by Jesus Christ. In this time of terrible mental darkness, rose John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, who, from their bold characters and convincing reasoning, effected a comparatively great reformation in the church, considering the age in which they lived; but much remains yet to be done, before all the rubbish which the bigots of the dark had heaped on the fair Christian fabric, can be entirely removed. A correct translation of the Bible, with the light of increasing science, he recommended as the best means of bringing back the Christian church to its original simple state, as in the days of the Apostles."

I cannot avoid asking a few questions—in this respect I am unfortunately incorrigible. First. At what time was the Christian religion so corrupted that the idea of one, holy, just, and good God was almost obliterated from the Christian world? Secondly. At what time was the Christian religion so grossly corrupted, that a system of corrupt priestly government, where every crime might have been committed for wealth, was substituted instead of the divine morality taught by Jesus Christ? Thirdly. Who were the "bigots of the dark" that heaped all the rubbish on the fair Christian fabric? Fourthly. How can the light of increasing science be added to a correct translation of the Bible? Fifthly. Are all the former translations of the Bible incorrect? Sixthly. Where is the authentic copy from which a correct translation should be made? Seventhly. Who will testify and prove its authenticity? Eighthly. How shall we know that the new translators will deserve more credit than the former translators? Ninthly. How can a pure translation of the Bible bring back the Christian church to its original simple state, as in the days of the Apostles? Tenthly. How many hundred years was the world deluded by imagining it had the doctrines of Christianity, when it really had them not? And, lastly. When did the Christian religion become corrupt and perverted; and when did it become pure, or is it yet pure?

I know, sir, the kind of answer you would give me, but I do not want yours. I wish you could prevail upon the Rev. Mr. Little to answer these questions, and by his great erudition to satisfy

CURIOSITY.

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 19, 1822.

To the several Christians who adhere to the Reformation of John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin.

Dear Friends:—If you will have the goodness to read my letter of this date to the editor of the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, you will perceive that a Rev. Mr. Little, preaching on the 9th of the present month in Washington, D. C., at the dedication of an Unitarian church, described in as good set terms as either of yourselves or of your predecessors could or would, the abominations of Popery. But, dear friends, he has gone much farther, and impiously put forth his hand against the ark of the Lord; for he says that your great founders, "though they effected a comparatively great reformation in the church, considering the age in which they lived;" yet "left much to be done before all the rubbish which the bigots of the dark had heaped on the fair Christian fabric can be entirely removed."

Allow me to ask you, dear friends—Have your several reformations been all imperfect, and do you still preserve some of the rags of the scarlet lady? Or is Mr. Little presumptious and erroneous, when he charges those great men whom the Lord raised up to reform his church, with leaving their work unfinished? Who is to inform me whether I shall adhere to John Knox, to Martin Luther, to John Calvin, or to Rev. Mr. Little? Who or what shall save me from this perplexity? The Bible? I have read it, and it does not even contain the name of the Rev. Mr. Little, nor of the zealous John Knox, nor of the mild Martin Luther, nor of the liberal and tolerant John Calvin. But wo is me, this is not all; the same Mr. Little asserts that the Bible is incorrect. The Lord pardon me; no, I was wrong; he does not say the Bible, but our translations. Yes, those translations are incorrect, and he does not say that we have one correct one. What then, good friends, are we to do? This same Mr. Little appears to me to have equal claim to a divine commission with either of those venerable men whom you follow—shall I reject him? Who will deliver me from this torture of doubt, and satisfy

CURIOSITY.

In the eighth number of the *Miscellany*, for July 24th, appeared the following explanation from the author of the sermon, under the title:

CURIOSITY AND THE REV. ROBERT LITTLE.

"Thou shall not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

We copy the following article from a Washington paper:

WASHINGTON, July 11th, 1822.

To the Editors.

Gentlemen: I will thank you to inform (through the medium of your paper) the editor of the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, that I do not hold myself responsible for any misrepresentations in the public newspapers, of what I may have said in my sermons, for that is not the mode in which I am wont to communicate on religious topics. The subject of his correspondent "Curiosity's" string of queries is, however, easily answered. The report, in the *Washington Gazette*, by an anonymous "Auditor" of my sermon, preached at the dedication of the Unitarian Church here, is about as much like my discourse, as it is like the Declaration of Independence. I never preach extemporaneously, and hope that I do not usually talk nonsense. On looking again at my notes, I perceive, particularly, that I did not say anything about "the idea of one holy, just, and good God, being almost obliterated from the Christian world:" nor of "the bigots of the dark" (ages, I suppose the reporter meant, but there was nothing of the kind in my sermon), nor yet about a "translation of the Bible," correct or incorrect. It would have been scarcely more foreign to my general reasoning, on that occasion, to have talked about a translation into a bishopric; nor did I mention either the names or actions of John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin. The editor of the *United States Catholic Miscellany* will, doubtless, as an act of justice, insert this in reply to the paper of "Curiosity," in his number for June 26th. I hope his correspondent will not persist in demanding, as a proof of my "erudition," the vindication of other men's mistakes. But, if other remarks are made, which have a claim to serious consideration, I shall not be averse from replying to them in a spirit which no genuine Catholic can condemn; though, as a Unitarian, I should protest against certain doctrines, as corruptions of Christianity, which he may deem sacred truths. I beg leave to assure "Curiosity," that I make no pretensions to a "divine commission," and therefore, he may use as great freedom of investigation as he pleases with me, provided always that the text is genuine.

ROBERT LITTLE.

The reverend gentleman has a claim, and a well-founded one, to candour, though he makes no pretensions to a divine commission. We do not propose to ourselves to enter upon a discussion of his tenets, which are certainly very much in opposition to ours; but he will feel that an article inserted in the public papers, and circulated through the United States, evidently calculated to impress the public, that he had made a

violent and uncalled-for-attack upon the Roman Catholics, warranted our friend "Curiosity" in calling upon him for an explanation. The reverend gentleman has given that explanation, in such a manner as to show that some unprincipled writer has, by the same act, borne false witness against him and the Roman Catholics.

EDITORS of *The Miscellany.*

The next number of the *Miscellany* gives us the following brief, but significant paragraph:

"CURIOSITY."

If our friend will have the goodness to send to our office, we shall furnish him with a Washington paper which will afford him amusement and employment.

In the tenth number, for August 1, appeared the extract from the Washington paper alluded to, which is here subjoined.

In answer to Mr. Little's note, published in the *National Intelligencer* and in the *Washington Gazette* of the 13th inst:[29]

Mr. Editor:—I have very inadvertently fallen into a religious dispute with an esteemed friend, and a Mr. "Curiosity," a writer in the *Catholic Miscellany*, published in Charleston, S. C., and must beg the indulgence of your columns to get me out.

First. A word to my friend Mr. R. Little, with respect to misrepresenting his discourse at the opening of the Unitarian Church, on the 9th ult: It is very true, in my report, I did not use the exact words of his discourse, nor did I intend to do so; it was the general tenor, and the principles to be deduced from it, that were intended to be conveyed; and this was done, as far as my recollection served. But, somehow or other, what between a memory always holey, and then being shaken by the ague, which must have sifted out my ideas as through a riddle, together with some mistakes in printing, I completely failed in my object. However, the evil is not past remedy; let Mr. Little either publish the sermon, or preach it over, and all will be well again,—for the public will then be both satisfied and benefited. I wish I could clear up every other part of his note to the public in so satisfactory a manner; but I confess, there are some parts of it which I really do not understand, and I think must also puzzle others. When he says, "I never preach extemporaneously, and hope that I do not usually talk nonsense," does he mean, because he does "not preach extemporaneously," he therefore never speaks nonsense,—or because those who do

[29] From the *Washington Gazette*, July 20.

preach extemporaneously do preach nonsense? Now, for his own sake, (for he sometimes prays extemporaneously,) and also for the sake of a very large body of Christians who preach extemporaneously, I hope he will give a satisfactory explanation. Or, perhaps he means the word nonsense to be applied only to the report of the sermon.

When speaking of the Bible, does he mean to say that he considers the present translation correct? If he do, why does he so often, and so judiciously too, point out errors and mistranslations, by quoting Greisbach, Wakefield, and other modern translators?

If he does not consider the Christian religion (as generally taught) corrupted, and different from that taught by Christ and his Apostles, why attempt to reform it?

I acknowledge, with respect to the names of John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, I do not think they were mentioned by him; yet he certainly, both on that, as on other occasions, spoke of the Unitarian Church being founded on the "old Protestant principle" of reformation, and suited to the present state of increased knowledge or science. There certainly was no violation of truth, merely to add the names of the actors, where the actions themselves were so clearly mentioned.

Did I not know Mr. Little better, I would be led to suspect, from the note referred to, that he wished to deny or renounce these fundamental principles of the Reformed Christian Church; but I do know to the contrary; and can only smile at the alarm his imagination has taken for his oratory being so badly reported. Yes, I believe I know him well; and esteem him as a preacher of the first order, for the soundness of his doctrine, the purity of his morality, the simple and sublime piety of his prayers, and, above all, for his own chaste and moral conduct in private life.

A few words now to our Catholic friend, "Mr. Curiosity."

What evil genius has tempted you to lift the veil of the Catholic Church, and to disclose those abominations, which the obscurity of time had begun to hide from an age which despises and abhors them?

The Catholic Church pretends to abuse the Reformation and all those who take part in it: yet, there can be no doubt, that that church has received as much benefit from that Reformation as any other. The present Catholic Church, as conducted in the United States, is no more like that in the time of Clement the Fifth, or Leo the Tenth, than the greatest sinner is like the greatest saint. Had that church been at that time what it now is, in this country, it is probable there would not have been a Lutheran, or Episcopal Church; for, if they really believe

all that is stated in their creeds, they might as well believe a little more, and take in with the whole Catholic faith, the infallibility of the Pope, purgatory, transubstantiation, the Virgin Mary, saints, and so forth.

I was in hope that my friend, Mr. R. Little himself, would have answered your eleven simple queries, for I know of no one more capable; but since he has totally disavowed having said anything about the principles upon which they are founded, I must even do the best I can to justify the assertions I have made.

First. Your eleven queries are very easily reducible to three: 1st, Those which relate to the corrupted state of religion at the Reformation. 2d, The incorrectness in the translation of the Bible. And 3d, How the Bible is to be rendered more correct, and the abuses and corruptions in religion reformed.

The answer to the first, which will comprehend your first, second, and third, will be best found in your own church history. And as it is impossible, in an essay of this kind, to detail the facts of each age or reign, I will give a brief account of some of the Popes, who were considered the Vicegerents of God, the head of the church, and infallible: surely the body was not better that the head.

Here follows a list of twenty-seven Popes, whom the writer accuses of the following crimes, viz., persecution, obtaining the acknowledgment of title from a murderer, pretending to cure lepers by a kiss, and not being able to prolong their own lives, privileging murderers and thieves, excommunicating kings and emperors, honouring saints, hating one another, ill-treating one another, cancelling each other's acts, incest, adultery, killing by poison, theft, magic, invoking devils, witchcraft, loving learned men, being alive in Italy when a man was killed in England, inventing transubstantiation, imposing auricular confession on the people, ordering bells to be rung, putting crowns on emperors, kicking them off, exempting the clergy from payment of taxes, having great humility, being poisoned by figs, making indulgences saleable, burning men whom they never burned, approving marriages of the clergy, turning out numerous cloistered nuns, being soldiers, throwing a key into the Tiber, brandishing a sword, burning Luther's books, declaring him and his followers heretics, giving a cardinal's hat to a sodomitical boy, altering the callender, (we spell it as the accuser does,) contriving the massacre of Protestants, sainting Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Inquisition and the Jesuits.

The writer then proceeds:

I could name many more whose characters are similar to those I have given, but I think I have given enough to show what state the church must have been in with such men at its head; and what must have been the ideas of the Christian Roman Catholic Church, with respect to a "holy, just, and good God," in these times!

The worship of the Trinity was introduced into the church about the time of Constantine, in 311. By and by prayers to the Virgin Mary were offered; then prayers to many hundred saints, saintesses, images, and paintings; false miracles were pretended to be wrought by relics of bones, teeth, nails, dishes, forks, spoons, cups and cupboards, houses, chairs, benches, blocks, hats, gowns, shoes, and every kind of trash that could be collected. At the time of Luther and the Reformation, indulgences from the least to the greatest crime could be purchased from the Pope, from eating flesh on fast days, or drinking wine, to murder[ing] father or mother; and for crimes that are too shocking to be named; a list of which I would have subjoined, if this piece were not already too long. I appeal to Mr. "Curiosity," and the candour of his own church, to say, was there not need of reformation? and was not the idea of a just God almost obliterated from the Christian world at that time?

I have omitted to say anything of the horrid massacres, the bloody Inquisition, the rebellions, and other dreadful calamities brought on mankind by the Romish Church; the history of every Christian country is full of them; for till the Reformation, that church, by its agents, had for 1200 years debased, robbed and murdered mankind.

Second Quere,—As respects the correctness of the Bible, I shall select only one example of its incorrectness; it is a very important passage to Trinitarians; and the only direct one, that I know of, which would support the doctrine of Trinity: it has been proved, and is acknowledged by many learned men calling themselves orthodox, to be an impudent direct forgery; and is to be found in *I John*, 5th chapter, 7th verse, viz., "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." The Bishop of St. David's has lately written a book to prove the genuineness of this passage; and the work has lately been reviewed in the *Quarterly Review*, published in London, republished in Boston, and will be found, I believe, in No. 57. Though the reviewers acknowledge also that the passage referred to is not genuine; for it is not to be found in any of the ancient Greek manuscripts, and the farthest back it can be traced, is about the fifteenth century. But it is no wonder that such a forgery has been committed, when we consider in whose hands the Scriptures

were almost exclusively for nearly 1200 years. Now, sir, I would treat the Roman Catholic Church like a man who had been convicted of perjury,—I would not believe her, though she spoke the truth.

Third Quere—How a more correct translation of the Bible can be obtained. Let all the Christian nations depute learned men to the United States, and with others selected here, make a correct and impartial translation; for here there being no established religion by law, nor anything to be feared from princes, there is every reason to believe a fair translation would be made, without any regard to sectarian principles.

I hope it will be understood, as I have before stated, that these observations are not intended to be applied to the members of the present Catholic Church, especially in the United States,—for here they have proved themselves as good and tolerant citizens as any in the country.

AUDITOR.

Note.—Those who wish to be better informed on this subject will consult the following works, viz. Bower's *Lives of the Popes*; *Hist. de l'Eglise* d'Eusebe, and so forth; Burnet's *Hist. of the Reform*; Mos. *Eccl. Hist.*, and Socratis et Sozomeni *Hist. Eccl.*

In the same number of the *Miscellany* which contained the foregoing, appeared the following under the title

FALSEHOOD.

In our last we noticed our having a document extracted from a Washington paper, which would furnish amusement and employment for our friend "Curiosity." The following is his letter, after having seen the paper:

August 2, 1822.

To the Editor of the Catholic Miscellany.

Sir:—I have read the paper signed "Auditor," in the *Washington Gazette* of the 20th ult. which you furnished me. I have also read the answer of the Rev. Mr. Little to my inquiries; and after having seen that gentleman's communication, I was satisfied that some unprincipled writer had been, as you stated, by the same act bearing false witness against that gentleman and the Roman Catholics, and I only was anxious to know who was this unprincipled writer. I was satisfied that he bore false witness against Mr. Little, because that gentleman publicly stated that he did: and I find that statement upheld by the avowal of this same Auditor, in which he acknowledges, that what he gave the public as Mr. Little's sermon, was not what he preached: so that by the

testimony of a valued friend, whom he knows well, esteems as a preacher of the first order, for the soundness of his doctrines, the purity of his morality, the simple and sublime piety of his prayers: and, above all, for his own chaste and moral conduct in private life—by such a witness as this, he is convicted of falsehood; and by his own testimony, the fact of the falsehood is not only admitted, but the intention of which we could have no better, nor, in fact, other ordinary testimony than his own, is brought into evidence, for he not only says, "It is true, that in my report I did not use the exact words of his discourse, nor did I intend to do so; it was the general tenor, and the principles to be deduced from it, that were intended to be conveyed." That he bore false witness against the Roman Catholics, I believed, because they denied the charges which were brought against them, and I thought them worthy of credit.

But now, sir, see the dilemma to which I am reduced. This same man, whom Mr. Little, his friend, convicts of falsehood, tells me, "I would treat the Roman Catholic Church, like a man who had been convicted of perjury; I would not believe her, though she spoke the truth." I cannot believe him if I believe Mr. Little; and if I believe him, I cannot believe the Roman Catholic Church. Again, he says Mr. Little is a good witness, and this good witness tells me that this man told falsehoods.

Again, sir, I am no church historian, and he brings a formidable list of iniquity against the Roman Catholic Church. Is this list a correct statement? and is all this heap of contradiction and crime, the boasted infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church?

Sir, I asked a few questions, because I am a simple, plain man who wants information; and as you have undertaken to put yourself forward to give it, I must now leave it to you to satisfy the public if you can, and to answer the questions of

CURIOSITY.

We do acknowledge that a task, by no means trifling, has been now imposed upon us; and though we were not prepared to be left thus unaided by our friend "Curiosity," we must admit the correctness of his reasoning. But, as no man can undertake to get out of difficulties until he shall have first surveyed and known them, it is fair that we should be allowed to examine our ground.

What is the case at present? Rev. Mr. Little preached a sermon in Washington. An anonymous writer gives what appeared to be the abstract of that sermon. Rev. Mr. Little states, that "it is no more like what he preached, than it is like *The Declaration of Independence.*" The anonymous writer says that Mr. Little showed, "that the idea of

one holy, just and good God, was almost obliterated from the Christian world." Mr. Little says, "I perceive particularly that I did not say anything about the idea of one holy, just, and good God, being almost obliterated from the Christian world." Writer: "Much remains yet to be done before all the rubbish, which the bigots of the dark had heaped upon the fair Christian fabric, can be entirely removed." Preacher: "I perceive particularly that I did not say anything about the 'bigots of the dark,' (ages I suppose the reporter means, but there was nothing of the kind in my sermon.") Writer: "A correct translation of the Bible, with the light of increasing science, he recommends as the best means of bringing back the Christian Church to its original simple state, as in the days of the Apostles." Preacher: "I perceive particularly that I did not say anything about a translation of the Bible correct or incorrect. It would have been scarcely more foreign to my general reasoning on that occasion, to have talked about a translation into a bishopric." Writer: "In this time of terrible darkness, rose John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, who, from their bold characters and convincing reasoning, effected a comparatively great reformation in the church, considering the age in which they lived." Preacher: "Nor did I mention either the names or actions of John Knox, Martin Luther, or John Calvin."

From these premises we unhesitatingly draw this conclusion: either the Rev. Mr. Little, or the anonymous writer, gave a grossly false statement deliberately to the public.

Now, from the remarks in the preceding letter, we are of opinion that the person who signs himself "Auditor," is the [falsifier]. We have additional reasons for this opinion. 1. Mr. Little has his character at stake: he is known, and comes forward openly before that public which heard him, and could and would convict him if he made a false statement. 2. There is a degree of gentlemanly candour in his mode of denial, which is almost inseparable from truth, and never can be assumed by falsehood. Mr. Little does not deny that he differs from the Roman Catholic Church, and believes her doctrines erroneous; but he does it like a gentleman; and whilst he asserts his opinions freely, he abstains from calumny and mean falsehood. 3. The person who wrote the paragraph, gives stronger testimony than even that quoted by "Curiosity" of his own falsehood: for he states in the offensive article which we insert in our last page, "That it was the general tenor and principles to be deduced from it (the sermon) that were intended to be conveyed: and this was done as far as his recollection served;" but he instantly acknowledges, that "somehow or other," mark the vulgarism

of his phraseology, "I completely failed in my object," that is, in giving even the general tenor, and the principles to be deduced from the discourse: and mark the excuses which he offers as an apology to a deceived public—"a memory always holey"—"being shaken by the ague, which must have sifted out my ideas as through a riddle"—"together with some mistakes in printing." To stoop to carp at the drawling vulgar imitation of English which he writes, would be wasting our time upon the detached gossamers which float near his den—we have other occupation. When a man is bound by duty, or called upon by the public voice to do an act, which want of ability or of opportunity prevents his performing well, his excuse is admissible, if he has proved that he did his utmost to act as he ought; but, when an incapable meddler thrusts himself upon the public, and is convicted of having, by his incapacity, done mischief, his weakness of intellect, or physical incompetency, ought not to shield him from the punishment he deserves. Who called for the interference of this man, who so plainly avows his well-known and continued intellectual incompetency; with his "memory always holey?" Who called him from his chamber to shake falsehood and discord into the Union, as he would sift ideas through a riddle? with his memory so "holey" and his zeal so hot! ! Why should he lay the blame upon the printer, who was doomed to publish his productions, and to bear his faults, without showing what those mistakes of the printer are? Did the man with the "holey" memory, and the shaking hand, write negative propositions, and the printer publish them in the affirmative?

This brings us to our former place. We have now given our reasons for the opinion, that Mr. Little did not preach as Auditor reported.

This false report of Rev. Mr. Little's sermon contained several insinuated charges of the introduction of horrible error and the destruction of Christianity against the Roman Catholics; a correspondent of ours gave the obnoxious passage, and respectfully asked Mr. Little, when and by whom those errors were introduced, and this destruction effected. Mr. Little denied having made the charges, and requests the denial to be published. The original fabricator published the article, which will be found in our last page, extracted from the *Washington Gazette* of July 20. We gave it to our correspondent "Curiosity," and he tells us it is our duty to answer it.

We have not sought this dispute, but we cannot now avoid doing our duty. Not only does the writer uphold the positions of his first article, but in his second, he goes much farther, and accumulates, by way of evidence to support his positions, a number of specific facts respecting

several Popes, of which we have only given the general substance in the insertion of this day, but which we shall publish and examine in detail, as we go on. So far as to "Auditor;" he is the assailant—we are only defendants. By the first and second articles of our prospectus, we are bound to answer him; and if in doing so, any question of controversy shall be introduced, be it remembered, that we are not the assailants.

Our friend "Curiosity" appears to us to lean too heavily upon us; we do think he ought to do more than ask questions. This is the second time he has thrown upon us the discharge of what ought to be his own duty. A question or two are easily asked, but it will take time to answer them. There are two of his which we must advert to—"Is this list (of iniquity) a correct statement?" He knows it is not. "And is all this heap of contradiction and crime the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church?" He knows it is not. Again, we intreat him not to heap too much upon us at once: he ought rather to help us.

Now for the editor of the *Washington Gazette*. In his paper of the 20th of July, which contains the second communication of "Auditor," he has the following paragraph:

"We have admitted into our columns to-day the explanations of 'An Auditor,' in relation to the tenor of Mr. Little's sermon, preached at the late opening of the Unitarian Church. However repugnant we feel to religious controversy, we could not, in fairness, withhold the present communication, though 'An Auditor' has taken an undue advantage of our indulgence, by coupling with his explanation a reply to 'Curiosity,' with whom we have nothing to do; and voluntarily thrown himself in the breach of opinion, as the shield of Mr. Little against the Catholics. Thus a vindication is thrust into our paper, which we never intended. Mr. L. should stand alone; we remonstrated with our correspondent for this interference: but as he has already released us, by promise, from all further obligation to insert anything more on the subject, we have complied with his request."

Can you, brother editor, in justice, refuse or decline to publish our answer to the long catalogue of invective, and we call it, and will prove it, falsehood, which you have admitted into your paper, against the Roman Catholics? Did you not allow Auditor to "take an undue advantage of your indulgence by coupling with his explanations," not "a reply to Curiosity," but a huge mass of libellous invective and bad logic, we would not have to call upon you, in the name of the Roman Catholics, to suffer the answer to accompany the charge. Or, if you have opened your columns to the one, and will close them against the other, are you an impartial conductor of a public print? We trust we shall always have reason to believe that you are.

In the twelfth number of the *Miscellany*, for August 21st, the controversy which

had arisen under the circumstances explained by the foregoing extracts, was commenced and regularly continued till its completion.

FALSEHOODS.

The man in Washington who misrepresented Rev. Mr. Little's sermon, and by the same act bore false witness against his esteemed friend, and against the Roman Catholics, instead of answering the eleven queries of "Curiosity," says they are reducible to three, and evades answering either of them; in exactly such a way as we have been told of a lady, whose conduct could not bear the closest scrutiny, having done, when asked by her judge, "Did you commit those crimes which are alleged against you?" She instantly said, "There are too many questions involved in that one. I cannot remember their order; but I tell you those persons who have accused me are the greatest villans in the world; if you knew them as well as I do, you would not believe them even when they told truth;" and then launched forth into an enumeration of all the faults and crimes of which they were even capable; and, with an air of triumph, concluded her speech as others began theirs, by asking: "What evil genius has tempted you to lift the veil of your iniquity, and to disclose those abominations which the obscurity of time had begun to hide, from an age which despises and abhors them?"

Every one must perceive that this tirade was no answer; and that the lady under charge should first suffer her own trial to proceed, before she embarrassed the court with extraneous matter. But the getting up of cross bills of indictment, in order to confuse and embarrass the investigation of truth, is an old trick of every pettifogging brawler who disregards truth and justice, and seeks only to escape detection and punishment. But we shall, instead of being prosecutors in the case, put ourselves to the bar, and take our trial.

What is the charge?

"I think I have given enough to show what the state of the church must have been with such men at its head; and what must have been the ideas of the Christian Roman Catholic Church with respect to a 'holy, just, and good God,' in these times."

The charge here is, that the idea of one holy, just, and good God, was almost obliterated from the Christian world. There are several subsequent counts, but we prefer taking them separately; they shall all be investigated. How is the first charge supported by evidence?

The accuser says, "The answer will be found in your own church history." Suppose, for a moment, we admit all his facts, what is his principle?

He tells us, "I will give a brief account of some of the Popes who

were considered the vicegerents of God, the head of the church, and infallible; surely the body was not better than the head."

We answer, this principle will not induce his conclusion. His last assertion chiefly contains the principle, and is a palpable untruth, as well in physics as morals, or politics, or any species of government, it is unfounded. A man with a well-organized body may have a faulty head; for aught we know, our accuser himself may be an example. He may, when his fit of ague is off, have an excellent healthy body; yet his head is not good, for he has at least a very "holey memory." A society of well-conducted good men may occasionally be under the government of a very worthless profligate; here the body would be better that the head. Did he never know of a pious society of Christians having had sometimes the misfortune of being under a bad clergyman? If not, his experience must be limited indeed. Was no state ever governed by a wicked prince, and yet the great body of the people uncontaminated? Were all the Romans partakers of the profligacy of Tarquin? And even in religion, were all the Calvinists guilty of the burning of Michael Servetus, because John Calvin was guilty? Are all the Lutherans supporters of bigamy, because Martin Luther and his companions authorized Philip of Hesse to marry two wives at one time? Is every Scotch Presbyterian a fanatic, because John Knox was such? And if an American Secretary of War suffers a handful of foreign troops to ransack the capital of the nation, is the whole military force of this country cowardly or perfidious? There might have been Popes who were infidels, but it will not follow that the whole of the church therefore lost its faith.

In this little sentence, containing the principle of the accuser's proof, there is also a direct false statement; because it is not a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that the Pope is infallible.

In the assertion of that falsehood, placed as it is, there is an unfair insinuation, viz.: that because the Pope is the vicegerent of God, Catholics believe him to be impeccable, and therefore that all his acts are virtuous.

Catholics might believe the infallibility of the Pope, and yet this man's semblance of reasoning be of no avail; for they would not, therefore, believe the Pope to be impeccable.

A scriptural instance will illustrate this position. In a part of the sacred volume, which the light of increasing science has left as yet uncontaminated, the Jewish high priest says, that it was better that one man should die, and the whole nation be saved; and the Evangelist informs us, that this declaration of truth was made by him in conse-

quence of his office of high priest; not of himself, but because of the aid of divine truth, which God promised his lips should reveal upon public occasions of doubt and difficulty; yet, though he gave the declaration of truth, he was a bad man and an unworthy high priest. To be an instrument of God for declaring truth with infallible certainty, in virtue of a divine institution, does not require that the person making the declaration should be impeccable.

A child may see the distinction between infallibility, which is the power of certainly declaring truth, and impeccability, which is an exemption from sin. A sinner may be infallible; and a fallible being may be impeccable.

Besides supposing a person to be infallible for one purpose, it does not follow that he is so for every other purpose. If I be present at any act which comes fully and entirely under my observation, I can infallibly testify what I have observed. But I cannot give the same testimony for what has not come under my observation. If I receive a commission to do a certain act, I can do that act lawfully, but it does not follow that I therefore claim the same right to do every other act.

Suppose, then, the Catholic doctrine was, "The Pope will tell you with infallible certainty, whether Jesus Christ revealed any particular tenet, and he will tell you with infallible certainty whether God revealed this principle of morality;" it will not follow, as a natural consequence, that this doctrine is false, if I could prove that all the Popes that ever existed were wicked men; because the question is not concerning their impeccability, but concerning their infallibility. Neither does it follow, that "the idea of one holy, just, and good God" was almost obliterated from the minds of the Popes themselves, because they were wicked; for a man may believe in one holy, just, and good God, and yet be a profligate; neither does it follow, that the idea of such a God was almost obliterated from the world, if every Pope that sat upon the chair of St. Peter was an infidel.

But, how much weaker are the graspings after logic of this accuser, when it is no article of the Catholic faith that the Pope is infallible, or that he is impeccable?

Thus his principle is unfounded, and his assumptions of fact involved in that principle false. We leave our readers to judge of the value of his conclusion. His reasoning would indeed be good, were he to lay it down thus: if I prove to you from church history, that the greater part of the teachers of the Roman Catholic Church, or a very considerable portion thereof, have, at a particular time, taught doctrines

perfectly incompatible with the notion of "one holy, just, and good God," then you will admit that I am warranted in concluding it probable, that the idea of one holy, just, and good God was, at that time, almost obliterated from amongst them; for it is likely that such teachers would not be received by a people who did not agree with them in doctrine;—but that is what the accuser cannot do; he can never prove the facts which would make the conditional truth of this argument absolute; and, even if he could, his conclusion would be only a probability, it would not be evident fact. But the contradictory to this can be proved true, and hence the evidence all lies the other way. We have had a conversation with "Curiosity:" and he tells us, it was the knowledge of those facts, and his feelings, at the arrogance of scarcely half-instructed self-sufficient writers, and not an evil genius, that tempted him to lift the veil, for the purpose of exposing those whose pretentions to knowledge would be destroyed by examination.

Our accuser's principle being thus disposed of, we shall, in our next, take up some of his facts, and in our subsequent papers continue the examination, until we shall not only have lifted the veil, but removed it altogether; but, first, we must make one or two remarks upon his catalogue of the crimes of the Popes, previous to our entering upon the special examinations. He begins with Pelagius I., who came to the chair in the year 555, and ends with Gregory XV., who died in 1623, comprising a space of 1068 years, in which time there were 174 Popes, of whom he selects 27 as criminals. From the 27, we must, in all conscience, be allowed to make one subtraction: "Honorius II., a lover of learned men; Arnulphus, an Englishman, was murdered in his time, for taxing the vices of the clergy. He died lamented in 1130. A very tender mother." Such being the words and figures of the charge, we must throw it aside until we can assent to its being a crime, "to love learned men," or "to be alive when an Englishman is murdered," or "to have a person's death lamented." We suspect another bill also might be thrown out: "Benedictus X., a Lombard, a man of great humility, and desired to compose all broils, but was poisoned by a fig in 1303. Did not suit the church." This reduces the number to 25: that is, one-seventh of the whole number. Suppose, then, we try the case by this man's own principle, "the body will be like the head." We have six good men for one bad man. Now, what sort of reasoning is this? "From the year 555 to the year 1623, there were six virtuous Popes for every bad Pope; therefore, the idea of one holy, just, and good God, was almost obliterated from the Christian world." But, his argument is not even as strong as this; because, before Pelagius, there

were 60 good Popes, and after Gregory, 19 good Popes, that is, 226 to 25: that is, nearly ten to one; and, in our subsequent examination we will prove, that from those 25, whom he charges as criminals, there must be deductions, for we will show his charges to be unfounded in some instances, and in others not to be criminal.

We do not deny that there have been very bad men in the Papal chair; but, in the lapse of 1800 years, it would be indeed very extraordinary, if that situation were filled uniformly by men who were models of sanctity: the apostolic college of the Saviour was not without a traitor and a thief; and we need not blush for the Papal See, when we find its good men in the same ratio to the unworthy, as we find in that body which Christ himself appointed to be the teachers of nations; and, as the criminality of Judas does not argue the loss of faith, or of piety in the Apostles, nor in their companions, so neither does the criminality of one Pope in twelve, argue the loss of faith or piety in the Roman Catholic Church.

But, mark what sort of a writer we have to deal with: "John XI. was a wicked Pope, therefore the church was corrupted. Benedict X. was a good Pope, therefore the church was corrupted." The bearing of the evidence is to him a matter of no concern; the conclusion he must have, not because it follows, but because he wishes it. He reminds us of the foreman of the jury, that was impannelled to try a man for horse-stealing; his fellows could see no evidence to convict the prisoner, yet the foreman insisted upon writing guilty. Being asked how he could do so, he answered, "I know very well he never stole the horse, but you see he is a troublesome fellow, and is now in a clipstick. We have only to say one word, and he is fast, and we are quiet. We must get rid of him; and evidence or no evidence, I will find him guilty."

THE WRITER IN WASHINGTON.

We now come to a second specification of the charges against the Roman Catholic Church by this writer who by the same act bore false witness against the Rev. Mr. Little and the great majority of the Christian world. The specification is contained in the following phraseology:

"Deus-Dedit, the first, who died 617, pretended to have cured a leper by a kiss; but could not save himself one day alive. The clergy praised him because he enriched them, at the expense of the public. An impostor."

And in the following:

"False miracles were pretended to be wrought by relicts of bones, teeth, nails,

dishes, forks, spoons, cups, and cupboards; houses, chairs, benches, blocks, hats, gowns, shoes, and every kind of trash that could be collected.''

Now suppose all those miracles were really wrought, then Deus-Dedit was not an impostor, and it would also be untrue that false miracles were pretended to be wrought, or at least the meaning intended to be conveyed by this writer, who does not know how to convey his meaning by his words, would not be supported.

He means to charge Catholics with having pretended to work miracles when they did not work them; and if they intended to deceive, it is plain they would pretend to work real miracles. What would be the object of pretending to work false miracles? or, what is a false miracle? We have sometimes had to answer the charges of men who knew how to write in some language—men who knew the meaning of words; but this is the first time we had to put the charges into English, and then to answer them.

Now Catholics are charged with having destroyed the idea of one holy, just, and good God, first, because Pope Deus-Dedit pretended to cure a leper by a kiss; but could not save himself one day alive; secondly, because Catholics pretended to work miracles by relics of various descriptions; real miracles, not false miracles. We really do not know what a false miracle is; for if it be a miracle it is not false, and if it be false it is no miracle. What an useful thing good schooling is; it patches up the holes of a man's memory and mends the sieve; like charity ''it covereth a multitude of sins.''

Now suppose we choose to say that Deus-Dedit never asserted that he cured a leper by a kiss; how will the writer in Washington prove that he did pretend to cure the leper? Here is the extract from the register and we defy any other to be produced from the patent office in Washington. ''Deus-Dedit, being unanimously chosen to the pontificate, proved a great lover and encourager of the clergy''—this does not state ''that he enriched them at the expense of the public.'' '' 'Tis reported, that he was a person of so great sanctity, that meeting with a man who had a leprosy, he cured him of that disease with a kiss.'' Now, will he prove from this, that Deus-Dedit pretended to have cured a leper by a kiss? He may, indeed, prove that the people reported it, but not that the Pope pretended it; and the Catholic Church does not require any of her children to believe the report, unless they see evidence of its truth. That he did perform the cure, is no article of faith. A Catholic is, therefore, at perfect liberty to believe or disbelieve it as he chooses; and he who disbelieves it is as good a Catholic as he who does believe the miracle to have been wrought. For our own part, we

have no belief either way, for we see no ground to deny that it was done, neither have we proof that it was wrought; and hence, having no motive of judgment we cannot decide.

As for the miserable attempt at sophisticated witticism, which is the writer's own adjunct, "but could not save himself one day alive," it has not even the merit of novelty; it is the very expression used by his executioners to the Saviour, when he was fastened to the cross. Let him open the 15th chapter of the gospel of *St. Mark*, and he will read, unless the light of increasing science have blotted them out, the following words, v. 20: "And passing by, they blasphemed him, wagging their heads and saying, Vah, you could destroy the temple of God, and in three days rebuild it, 30. Save thyself now, coming down from the cross. 31. In like manner also, the high priests mocking, together with the scribes, said to one another, he saved others—himself he cannot save." There is, then, neither novelty nor religion in his remark; neither is there common sense in it; for every person who wrought miracles, as recorded in the Scriptures, died. The power was given to them, not for the purpose of prolonging their own lives, but for the purpose of convincing those who saw them, that they were messengers from God, and that the doctrines which they preached, were revealed by Him. But, perhaps this writer does not believe that a miracle was ever wrought. Many of those who call themselves Unitarians, do not believe that there was a miracle wrought at any time—others of them believe, that miracles have been wrought. We know not, whether the writer, who has given us so much trouble, belongs to either of those divisions, or as the phrase is in many places, "has his religion yet to choose."

At all events, we may now acquit Pope Deus-Dedit of being an impostor, and rank him amongst the good men who have filled the chair of St. Peter, for we have undoubted evidence of his sanctity, though not of the miracles which are attributed to him.

We are now come to the second part of the charge, and being put into English it stands thus: The Catholics pretended, that many miracles were wrought by relics, and so forth. The truth is, we do not pretend it, but we roundly assert it, and we have positive proof of it. To attempt entering at large upon this important subject, would take us too deeply, at present, into the examination of evidence, which we shall review hereafter. At present, we shall merely state, that the Catholic Church requires her children to believe, 1. That God can work miracles —that is, by his special intervention, suspend the laws of nature which he has himself made—or produce special effects beyond the power of those laws, or even contrary to the usual course of those laws. 2. That in fact

such special intervention has sometimes taken place, for we find it recorded in the Scripture, which is a register of God's revelation, and testified by other undoubted authority, from which no rational person can withhold his assent. 3. That all those related in the holy Scriptures did take place, because she requires her children to believe, that the holy Scriptures contain nothing but truth. 4. That God has occasionally given power to inferior beings, angels and men, to work miracles, not by their own natural and inherent force or power, but by his special commission and authority; for this assertion also, she has the distinct positive testimony of Scripture, and of other sufficient evidence. 5. That God has as much power to do so at present, and will continue always to have as much power to do so, as he ever had heretofore, because he is immutable. And 6. That Jesus Christ has made a special promise, indefinitely as to time, that this power should remain in the church, to be exhibited sometimes more frequently and glaringly, and at other times less so. It is useless to be accumulating proofs—one or two texts will exhibit her warrant for this last proposition. *Mark* xvi. 17: "But, those signs will follow them that believe, in my name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues. 18. They shall take up serpents: If they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them: They shall lay their hand upon the sick, and they shall be healed." And *John* xiv. 12. "Amen, amen, I say unto you, he who believeth in me, the works which I do, the same shall he also do, and greater than these shall he do, because I go to the Father." These are the expressions of the Saviour to his Apostles, in his last charges to them. And in the gospel of St. John, he was speaking of those works or miracles which were the proofs that he gave of his divine authority; those were miracles, and those were to be wrought in his church, or amongst the believers in him; not that every individual was to have the power, but that it was, from time to time, to be made manifest in his church. And as he affixed no period for the cessation of this manifestation, we cannot presume to do so; and we must be content to believe, that God can now, as well as at any former period, by himself, or by those whom he pleases to empower, work miracles, and that he will occasionally do so in his church to the end of time.

But the Roman Catholic Church does not require of her children to believe, that all the miracles which are said to have been wrought in the church since the days of the Apostles, were really wrought; nor does she require the belief of any one of them in particular. She has a tribunal for the examination of the evidences adduced in support of any one which it may be desired to place on record; and a more severely

examining tribunal is not to be found in the world. If this tribunal judges, there can be no doubt whatever of the facts stated having occurred, and that those facts are evidently miraculous, it records them as such, and the faithful are then allowed, not compelled, nor required to speak of them as miraculous, to write of them as such, and to consider them as such; but, if any individual should think he has sufficient reason to differ from that tribunal, he may believe as he pleases; but, it would be considered indecorous and disrespectful to assail its decision openly, though the dissenter from its decision is still a Catholic, because that alleged miracle is no article of faith, and because also, though that tribunal is respectable, yet it is not infallible. And also no Roman Catholic is allowed openly and publicly to teach that certain miracles have taken place, upon his own mere private judgment, but he is first to have the judicial decision of the proper tribunal; though that tribunal does not interfere with his private belief, it will restrain his public conduct.

This being the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church, upon the subject, we have no hesitation in saying, that though we believe many unfounded legends have been occasionally circulated by weak, or by wicked individuals, yet we believe, that many miracles have been wrought by relics of various kinds.

There are some expressions meant for wit, that perhaps are blasphemous. Thus, were some persons to read the second chapter of Book IV, or as it is in the Protestant Bibles, *Book II of Kings*, they would perhaps attempt to amuse us with a joke at the folly of Eliseus, or as he is called in the Protestant Bibles, we believe, Elizeus,[30] who divided the waters of the river with the cloak of Elias, and may ask, could any man in his senses believe, that an old rag of a cloak, given by a fanatic to a fool, who looked upon him to be a prophet, could dry up a large river? or whether any rational man could believe a river would open, and leave a dry passage for an old man of that sort to pass over? Now, if the Scriptures be the word of God, would not these questions be blasphemous? In the 13th chapter of the same book, it is recorded, that a man who was dead was raised to life by his body touching the bones of Eliseus, who had been dead for a considerable time—these are similar to the relics mentioned by the Washington writer. We could inform him of miracles wrought by handkerchiefs touched to the body of St. Paul, and of miracles wrought by the shadow of St. Peter—the record was formerly to be found in the *Acts of the Apostles* v. 15, chapter

[30] Elisha.

xix. v. 12, unless Griesbach, and the light of increasing science, have stolen it away.

Now, the ridiculous enumeration of dishes, forks, spoons, cups, and cupboards, horses, chairs, benches, blocks, hats, gowns, shoes, is a work of the writer's own imagination, for though his memory be "holey," yet his imagination, though flat and vulgar, still is somewhat prolific; for it has brought forth here some trash of every kind that could be collected, but we know not whence. He ought to tell us.

Upon this point, then, his statements are unfounded, his witticisms are blasphemous imitations of older blasphemies, his want of reasoning glaring, his charges libels, his insinuations unwarranted and unsupported; but, he has flung such a heap before us, that we shall not be done with him for a month as yet. May God forgive our friend "Curiosity," for bringing such trouble upon us, and leaving us to get out of it as well as we can. What a wicked rogue he must have been to lift his curtain!

From the *Washington Gazette* of August 20.

Mr. Editor:—In my communication of the 20th of July, I made a conditional promise that I would not again trouble you on the subject of religion. But two petulant scribblers, one in the *Metropolitan* of the 27th of July, published in Georgetown, D. C., and the other in the Charleston *Catholic Miscellany*, of the 7th instant, seem determined that this unpleasant discussion shall not terminate, as I most sincerely wished. Instead of proving, or endeavouring to prove, my statements and arguments false, they find it much easier to abuse me by the most unmerited epithets. They endeavour to divert the public attention from the matter in dispute, by constantly talking about Mr. Little, and what he says and thinks; thus, by making a noise about what no one can take any interest in, they hope that the main point may be overlooked; but that is a stale trick, and shall not answer their purpose at present. Mr. Little has thought fit to disavow the sentiments which I published; and as much as I esteem him, I think this act was, at least, unnecessary. And I will venture to assert, that they are the sentiments of the Reformed Christian Church, both in this, and in every other Christian country; at least, they are my sentiments, and I am much mistaken if they are not the sentiments of Mr. Little also. I will here state them with the substance of the queries of Mr. "Curiosity," and endeavour to prove, by the facts that I have advanced, the truth of my assertion; and I hope to be answered with candid and fair arguments, free from abuse or scurrility—for I honestly declare I have no wish to maintain the prin-

ciples of any sect at the expense of truth. Truth is the only object I have in view; and wherever that leads, I will follow. The sentiments published were these: that the "Christian religion, (before the Reformation,) like the Jewish, in the days of Hezekiah, was grossly corrupted and perverted in almost all respects:—the objects of divine worship had been greatly multiplied:—the idea of one holy, just, and good God almost obliterated from the Christian world:—and a system of corrupt priestly government, where every crime might have been commuted for wealth, substituted instead of the divine morality taught by Jesus Christ. In this time of terrible mental darkness, rose John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, who, from their bold characters and convincing reasoning, effected a comparatively great reformation in the church, considering the age in which they lived; but much remains yet to be done before all the rubbish which the bigots of the dark ages had heaped on the fair Christian fabric, can be entirely removed. A correct translation of the Bible, with the light of increasing science, is recommended as the best means of bringing back the Christian Church to its original state, as in the days of the Apostles."

I should like to be informed what there is in these sentiments to provoke the anger of the Catholic more than the Greek church. Here follows the substance of the eleven queries of Mr. "Curiosity:"—

"1st. Those which relate to the corrupted state of the Christian religion at the time of the Reformation. 2d. The incorrectness of the present translation of the Bible. 3d. How the translation is to be made more correct."

1st. With regard to the corruptions of the Christian religion at the time of the Reformation, (many of which still continue,) I gave a brief account of the acts and characters of some of the Popes, by which it will be seen when many of the corruptions were introduced into the church, and by whom. It also shows the shocking depravity which existed in the church, when such men were elected by the cardinals as its infallible head. There is scarcely a crime or a folly, to which man is liable, that was not committed by these worthless representatives of St. Peter. By a review of the statement, we find that this pretended infallible church was very often inconsistent with itself, for the acts of Formosus the First were rescinded by Stephen and by Sergius; afterwards the decrees of Stephen were made null by Romanus; and Johannes restored those of Formosus:—then again, these were rescinded by Sergius the Third. And Pius the Second (one of the most rational) differed from most other Popes, by allowing the clergy to marry, and turning out the cloistered nuns. Also, though Bonifacius the Third

obtained from Phocas the acknowledgment of the Pope's supremacy on earth, yet Sabinianus afterwards disclaimed this power.

I next endeavoured to prove, that the infallible heads of the church were often very immoral men, such as would have been a disgrace to the Newgate Calendar. As my accounts are chiefly drawn from the Romish Church History, I challenge any one to show that I have not given what is generally considered the true character of these men. Was not Johannes the Eleventh an adulterer, and killed by the husband of the woman with whom he cohabited? He also stands accused of poisoning above 200 persons, among whom were his two predecessors Leo and Stephen. Was not Martinus the Fourth also an adulterer, who kept the concubine of his predecessor Nicholas; and had all the pictures of bears removed from the palace, lest she should bring forth one?

Was not Benedictus the Ninth a conjuror, who pretended to understand the magic art, and to bewitch women? Did not Alexander the Sixth commit incest with his own daughter? This monstrous villain designed to poison several cardinals whom he invited to an entertainment; but the poison, as in the case of Hamlet, was given by mistake to himself.

Did not Paul the Third, who called the Council of Trent, prostitute his sister, commit incest with his daughter, and poison her husband, and attempt the chastity of his niece? and was he not also accused of being a necromancer and sorcerer?

Did not Gregorius the Thirteenth, who altered the calendar, contrive the massacre of the Protestants at Paris? And did not Gregorius the Fifteenth, the patron of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Society of the Jesuits, introduce the bloody Inquisition, wherever he had sufficient influence?

And did not Clement the Fifth introduce the sale of indulgences and pardons into the church? And did not Leo the Tenth extend that kind of traffic, so that indulgences and pardons were hawked about all Christian countries—like as our Yankees do their notions—for one might not only have purchased a pardon for all sins committed, but all that were to be committed? This, indeed, was the chief cause of the Reformation, and was the chief argument used by Luther to effect that purpose. To deny this, is to call all history false.

Now, gentlemen editors, it will behoove you to come forward, and with the aid of fair and impartial history, show that these charges are false, else you must stand convicted before the public of gross slander and calumny; and your church of every crime that has disgraced the

annals of mankind. But these crimes are, indeed, no more than might be expected from such a system of religion, whose doctrines teach, that God was pleased to receive the sacrifice of his only Son for the sins of the world: and that it is only necessary to believe this horrid blasphemy on the divine character, to be saved and be a favourite in heaven. And what can we think of a church with such men at its head, who institute auricular confession? by which means, it is put in possession of all public and private secrets; and has made use of this knowledge to extort money from all classes, from the meanest wretch who steals a loaf of bread, to the prince who murders his brother for his crown, like King John. This principle is the most dangerous to society that has ever been introduced into religion; for it is my opinion, that where it makes a part of the religion of the state, no free government can long exist. It is treason to liberty.

Will any Catholic deny that he believes in the doctrine of transubstantiation—in the good effects of holy water—in prayers to the Virgin Mary and to the saints—in the power of the Pope to remit sins, and in the miracles wrought by holy relics. In this part of my argument I am fortunately supported by the faith and practice of the church at present, to show what it was at the time of the Reformation: and though much has been reformed, yet, still enough remains to show the dreadful state it was in at that time. The pretended miracle of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, is a proof what kind of miracles were then wrought, and by whom. If the Catholic Church had any sense of shame, or felt any compunction for the injuries done to mankind, it would be desirous that the world should for ever forget its history. The mind recoils with horror at the bare reflection of its cruelties and its crimes. How many poor wretches have been condemned by the ministers of that church, without any chance of defence, in secret, without even the sympathy of mankind, to perish in damp dungeons—to be the cruel sport of ingenious tormentors, or to expire at the stake or on the scaffold!—whose greatest crime was, perhaps, that of denying that a piece of bread could be turned into flesh, or wine into blood, by the mere words of a priest: or perhaps, because they would not acknowledge that there were three persons in the Godhead, each equal to God, and yet be only one God. The reformation in religion, the increase of science, and the spread of the principles of civil liberty, have, at last, put an end to such horrid scenes in every country where they have been received. 'Tis only the other day since the prisons of the Inquisition were thrown open in Spain, and hundreds of the most miserable wretches released from

its dungeons. But, to the disgrace of the leaders of the revolution in Mexico, that horrid system is still retained in that country.

Now, Mr. "Curiosity," and your fellow-labourers in the Catholic cause, what think you of a system of religion which make such monsters of men? To the disgrace of the age in which we live, there are the greatest exertions now making to introduce into this country, and even into this district, the heart of the Union, the society and principles of the Jesuits. They are very cautious and gradual in their progress. 1st. They are only distinguished, as very learned, very obliging, and very sober, regular and polite gentlemen; no distinction in dress, except its being black. But, in the course of a few years, they have built a college in Washington, in addition to the one they formerly had in Georgetown; the students now wear nearly the dress of the monks; a nunnery has been instituted; and they have established a paper in Charleston, S. C., expressly to propagate and to defend their doctrines. This would be allowable, provided they did not make an improper use of their privileges; but, I must confess, I think they have shown a very unbecoming temper, of late, in their publications; for they ought to recollect that the great body of Christians in this country are Protestants; and, at the same time, to reflect on the forbearance they show to Catholics, compared to what Catholics have shown to them when in power.

In answer to the 2d query:—I pointed out, of many instances, wherein the Scriptures have been falsified by the interpolation of a very important text, viz. *I John* v. 7, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are One;" but, no notice has been taken of this forgery by these champions of the holy faith. When this is cleared up, there are other parts of the Scriptures relating to the miraculous conception, which will equally require the ingenuity and learning of the church to defend. Nothing can be more reasonable than that a new translation of the whole Scriptures should be made in the North American States, when it is considered under what circumstances the present translation was made. King James the First was certainly as great a bigot as ever filled the British throne!—who believed and wrote in favour of witchcraft and necromancy:—and the Episcopal, as established in England, is very near akin to the Romish Church: the only difference seems to be in the number of dogmas, not in their quality; many of the doctrines of each church are equally repugnant to common sense and the Scriptures.

Before I close this paper, I will just notice what has been said by Mr. A. B. respecting a pardon not having been sold by the Pope to Henry the Eighth, for divorcing his wife. The answer is plain. Henry had

nothing to offer to the Catholic church, equal to the courts of Spain, France, Italy and Germany. Had the Pope complied, (for I believe, from his higgling, he was much inclined to do so) he must have forfeited the favour of all Catholic princes, for the uncertain friendship of Henry. I am much surprised at the conduct of A. B. and of the editor, if not the same person, to endeavour to injure any one, by holding himself up to the public so as to designate him as an enemy to the Catholic church, and subjecting him, perhaps, to the wrath of infuriate bigots, especially when they are still ignorant of the real name of

AUDITOR.

THE WRITER IN WASHINGTON,

Who calls himself "Auditor," has, on the 20th of last month, come out in the *Washington Gazette*, in another long tirade against popery and papists, and Mr. Little and the Episcopalians.

This production consists principally of a condensation of his former matter, put more in the shape of something like reasoning, for he has had nearly six weeks to prepare it, and, as we suppose, has shaken off the ague and mended the sieve; he has added something new—such as asking, "Will any Catholic deny, that he believes in the doctrine of transubstantiation—in the good effect of holy water—in prayers to the Virgin Mary and the saints?" To this we answer, no Catholic will deny that he believes in those doctrines. But, we doubt very much, if the person who puts the question, knows what a Catholic believes, for we now begin to suspect, that his attacks proceed more from perfect ignorance of the Catholic doctrines, than from a knowledge of their being good or bad. Like many others, he heaps up a parcel of words, which he thinks he understands, and then says, "Will anybody deny that this is blasphemous?" Thus, he continues to ask, "Will any Catholic deny, that he believes the power of the Pope to remit sins?" We would venture to stake our existence, that he does not know the meaning of the Catholic's doctrine of the forgiveness of sins, or he never would have put the question. We shall not now dwell upon it—it will in its turn be examined. "Will any Catholic deny, that he believes in miracles wrought by holy relics?" "The pretended miracle of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, is a proof of what kind of miracles were then wrought, and by whom." Now we are very good Catholics so far as our belief, for we hereby profess and declare, that we believe every doctrine taught by the Holy Roman Catholic Church and still we neither believe nor disbelieve in the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, though we

have conversed with many well-educated men, whose minds were very free from weakness, and whose memories were not sieves, who assured us, that they witnessed this miracle, and had the very best opportunities for its examination; and we have seen the written and printed testimony of several hundreds of the same description, who, at different times, stated their having witnessed and closely examined it; yet, we are not bound to believe in its truth. We merely adduce this as a new proof of his not being acquainted with the nature of the subjects on which he presumes to write.

He states, that "he would not have troubled the public again upon the subject of religion, but two petulant scribblers, one in the *Metropolitan* of the 27th of July, published in Georgetown, D. C., and the other in the Charleston *Catholic Miscellany*, of the 7th of August, seem determined that this unpleasant discussion shall not terminate, as he most sincerely wished." What a pity! Yes, indeed, he sincerely wished to tell the people of the United States, that their Catholic neighbours professed a religion of the grossest corruption and most profligate character—and he most sincerely wished, that they should be suffered to believe this, without being disturbed—but those two petulant scribblers, the wicked rogues! Now, was it not very natural conduct for corrupt and profligate villains? They, indeed, determined that is should not terminate so; and "instead of proving, or attempting to prove his arguments and statements false, they find it much easier to abuse him by unmerited epithets." Poor gentleman! What a pity the constables do not commit them for this breach of the peace. Indeed, he almost says that they ought, for he tells us, speaking of the Jesuits, "And they have established a paper in Charleston, S. C., expressly to propagate and to defend their doctrines. This would be allowable, provided they did not make an improper use of their privileges; but, I must confess, I think they have shown a very unbecoming temper of late in their publication; for they ought to recollect, that the great body of Christians in this country are Protestants; and, at the same time, to reflect on the forbearance they show to Catholics, compared to what Catholics have shown to them when in power."

If this be not the threatening of a persecution for defending ourselves against his attacks, we know not what it is. In our future examination of this, for we must defend ourselves, this man has forced upon us a topic, which we have, as yet, avoided, and did hope we should not be driven to, viz., who were and who are the greatest persecutors? The liberty of the press is, in itself, a blessing, but how often has it been made a curse. We know of no forbearance shown to us. We ask for none.

Thank God, we are as free here, and that of right, and not by courtesy, as any men of any other religion in America. We do not, therefore, mean to insult our brethren of other communions, but we will suffer no one of them to insult the Catholic body with impunity. Here is a man who tells us, that our "system of religion makes monsters of men;" and that "to the disgrace of the age in which we live, there are the greatest exertions making, to introduce into this country, and even into the District of Columbia, the heart of the Union, the society and the principles of the Jesuits;" "that we make an improper use of our privileges;" "that if we had any sense of shame, or felt any compunction for the injuries done to mankind, we would be desirous that the world should for ever forget our history;" "that the mind recoils with horror at the bare reflection of our cruelties and crimes;" and yet this man talks of forbearance! ! ! and yet he talks of being "subjected, perhaps, to the wrath of furious bigots," for publishing the truth! ! ! He is known in Washington, where he says those tremendous Jesuits are so powerful; he had better, ere he walk out from his office, request the President to allow him a guard for his protection, if he be afraid of the Jesuits. Were there question only of the individual himself, he would, indeed, after such a display as he made, be found beneath the notice of the most insignificant, petulant scribbler. As such we shall treat him henceforward. We shall neither soil our paper with the epithets which he merits, nor encumber ourselves with his style, but we must refute his calumnies.

As to the Catholics of these States, we have the testimony of the father of his country, and of the public records and collections of the States, that wherever the intolerance of those who previously ruled the provinces, permitted Catholics to be found, they were amongst the foremost to establish their liberties. They had their representative in the Congress which declared our country independent—his name still shines upon the record. By the common right of man, which America proclaims—by the enthusiasm manifested by the Catholic in the defence of liberty—by the pledge of his life, his fortune, and his sacred honour, in the Declaration of Independence of the States—by the shedding of his blood by the side of his Protestant brethren, in defence of their common right—the Catholic of America has earned his freedom; and yet this man, who, if we be rightly informed, holds a place under the government, dares to tell that Catholic, that for freedom here he is indebted to Protestant forbearance! Did he say Protestant justice, he would have said truth. It is a fact, that the inhabitants of these States who were not Catholics are, and always have been, more numerous by

a vast majority, than those who are Catholics—the reason for which, we shall, in some future number, investigate; but, it is equally a fact, that in Maryland the Catholics were, at one time, more numerous, and they did then give that example of, we will not call it toleration, but justice, which most States subsequently followed, though not so much to their cost as it was to hers. Hence, as justice is not the peculiar attribute of any creed, we had better style it simply justice. It is to justice then, and not to forbearance, the Catholics owe that they stand in this country upon as high ground as the Protestants; and he who says that it is not to justice, but forbearance they owe it, libels the Constitution, and must have imbibed his principles either in North Carolina or in New Jersey—the Constitutions of which are still disgraced by a clause, which is a dead letter, but which, for the sake of decency, they ought to expunge.

We have been insensibly led into this rigmarole after having read No. 2 of the calumnies, but, we shall follow on the examination, which, instead of one month, will now probably take us three. "Auditor" is a capital jackall, he increases our fodder in a geometrical ratio—one number more from him, and we shall have occupation for some algebraist to cauculate how long.

Having now made our preliminary remarks, we proceed to examine another of his charges:

"Bonifacius the Fifth, who died in 625, privileged murderers and thieves who took sanctuary in the church, and decreed that the hand of justice should not molest them. What a righteous Church!"

Suppose Pope Boniface was a favourer of thieves and murderers, why should the writer conclude that the Church was unrighteous? What sort of an argument is this: "The King of England is an unjust man, therefore the English nation is unrighteous?" It is evident that the whole Church ought not to be charged with all the injudicious or unjust regulations made for particular places by persons who are not competent to make such laws for the whole Church.

But there is another principle which should never be lost sight of in the examining topics of this nature; that is, before we pass a censure to know all the facts. Now at the period when Pope Boniface made this law, the state of society in Italy was not such as it is now either there or here; there was more violence and less regard paid to law. Hence, there were feuds and quarrels and riots; frequently persons who committed crimes, fled to the churches in the expectation, that reverence for the temple of the God of Mercy, might stay the hands of their vindictive pursuers, who were too often in the habit of inflicting a summary pun-

ishment, without awaiting the slow and deliberate procedure of the courts of justice; frequently the innocent man who was unjustly accused, fled thither for the same purpose: and it not seldom happened, that their pursuers in their fury and vengeance, paid little regard to the sanctity of the place, so that the churches, more than any other places, became the scenes of the most disgraceful riots, and frequently houses of slaughter, and not of prayer.

To remedy this evil, Pope Boniface decreed, that persons flying to the churches under such circumstances, whether guilty or innocent, should not be torn out by force, but quietly given up by the ecclesiastics to the proper officer of the civil tribunal, who should regularly demand them, and that their pursuers, in place of rushing after them, as theretofore, should have recourse to the regular magistrate; and that when a demand was made with a warrant, the authenticity of which was certified by the proper person, and then the document exhibited to the superior ecclesiastic, that he might be satisfied of the regular authority of those who claimed the refugee, the refugee should be given up by the ecclesiastics, but that until then, he should have the privilege of sanctuary. Yet this is called "privileging murderers and thieves," and decreeing that the hand of justice should not molest them, and the writer, who thus distorts facts for the purpose of criminating a virtuous Pope, expects that he shall be treated with respect! ! ! and complains that he is "abused by unmerited epithets, in place of proving, or endeavouring to prove, his statement and arguments false."

We shall now lay before our readers the words of an account of this Pope in a work published by English Protestants, giving an account of the Bishops of Rome, and we here beg to remark, that in the whole of this examination our extracts giving an account of the acts or conduct of those calumniated men have been and shall be taken exclusively from Protestant authors, except where we state otherwise.

"As for Pope Boniface, he was a person of singular humanity, clemency, and obliging deportment towards all men, and neglected no part of the duty of a good bishop. He ordained, that criminals who fled for refuge to churches, should not be taken thence by force." We now ask any candid man, whether he does not think it was the duty of a good bishop, to make some regulation, if he could, to prevent the enormities which this regulation put an end to? Was it not consonant to the first principles of humanity and clemency? Boniface had before him a splendid model for his direction, because, as Griesbach had not then been born, nor the light of increasing science beamed forth in full lustre from the patent office in Washington, the Scriptures were

then entire; and hence it was found written in *Exodus*, chapter xxi. verse 12, and so forth. "He that striketh a man with a will to kill him, shall be put to death. But he that did not lie in wait for him, but God delivered him into his hands, I will appoint thee a place to which he might flee. If any man kill his neighbour, on set purpose, and by lying in wait for him, thou shalt take him away from my altar, that he may die." We find this the only exception to the privilege of sanctuary in the Jewish law. Yet, we doubt whether the man in Washington will add to the former blasphemies, that of saying that the God of Sinai "was guilty of privileging murderers and thieves."

If this man keeps the book of Deuteronomy in his canon of the Scriptures, we would advise him to read diligently the 19th chapter, and he will perceive how precise the Lord was in appointing, that the road to the cities of refuge should be kept in good repair, and that the cities should be conveniently situated, so that the way might not be too long, nor too difficult for the unfortunate refugee to escape from his pursuers, and he would there find the provincial law regulating the increase of the number of places of refuge, in proportion to the number of inhabitants; and he would also discover, that if any person who was not entitled to the privilege of sanctuary, took refuge in any of those cities, the pursuers, were not, therefore, at liberty to take him out by force, but they should apply to the proper tribunal of their own city, who judged the case, and then make the application for the offender, who, upon their demand, was delivered up; and the imitation of this is, by the writer in Washington, made criminal in Pope Boniface, and thence he concludes that the Roman Catholic Church is unrighteous. What logic!

But, be the regulation good or bad, it is no part of the Roman Catholic religion. It is a mere civil institution, the propriety of which the governments are to consider, and to adopt or reject as they think proper. Catholic governments have rejected it—Protestant governments have retained it—but it is no portion of the religion of either. As well might it be argued, that the Roman Catholic religion is gunpowder, because gunpowder was invented by a monk.

However, we must take the liberty of removing Boniface V. from the catalogue of "those Popes who would have been a disgrace to a Newgate Calendar."

We shall endeavour to make room for a greater number of the charges and answers in our next.

THE WRITER IN WASHINGTON.

We have admitted this obnoxious production into our pages, though the editor of the *Washington Gazette*, who has inserted his slanders, has discontinued publishing our replies. If, as it is stated, the editor and the writer be brothers, and that a person of the name of Elliott, in the Patent Office at Washington, be the defender of Unitarianism by his assaults on our religion, we do not feel much surprised at the exclusion of our answers; but the editor of the *Washington Gazette* has now lost all claims to impartiality; he has become a partisan.

We proceed to bring forward a tremendous culprit, "a very devil incarnate," to take his trial:

"Paul the Third called the Council of Trent; prostituted his sister; committed incest with his daughter, and poisoned her husband; attempted the chastity of his niece, and being found in the fact, was marked by her husband. He was a necromancer and sorcerer. Died in 1549. A very devil incarnate."

Suppose he committed all these crimes, is it a fair conclusion to draw, "therefore the idea of one holy, just, and good God, was almost obliterated from the world?" We have almost strained our eyes, and dried our brains, in pouring over both his productions, to discover the principle by which he would apply this fact to produce his conclusion, and all in vain, unless it be this paragraph, taken from his second publication:

"But these crimes are indeed no more than what might be expected from such a system of religion, whose doctrines teach that God was pleased to receive the sacrifice of his only Son for the sins of the world, and that it is only necessary to believe this horrid blasphemy on the divine character to be saved, and be a favourite of heaven."

But this principle will not apply, because it is not the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that faith alone is sufficient for salvation. This is one of the misfortunes of getting entangled with a man who is perfectly ignorant of the subject on which he undertakes to write; it is a purgatory almost as bad as to enter upon a discussion of canon law with the doctors of the Philadelphia school. We before showed that the principle he went upon was bad. "There were some bad Popes, therefore the idea of one holy, just, and good God, was almost obliterated from the Christian world." Now he takes up the old Protestant principle, invented by Martin Luther and John Calvin, and condemned as heretical by the Council of Trent, and he says that the doctrine which the Catholics condemn as heresy is held by them, and is the cause of their crimes; he then says, that "in this time of terrible mental darkness rose up John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, who, from their bold

characters and convincing reasoning, effected a comparatively great reformation in the church." Yet these three men were the inventors of the very doctrine which he says caused the crimes of the Popes, and which doctrine the Popes condemned. What can we say in answer to a man of this description?

But let us take the former part of this principle. The doctrine of the atonement by our blessed Lord and Saviour, the Godman Jesus Christ, which he calls a blasphemy, was professed by John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, as well as by the Popes. In this they effected no change. We cannot conceive the principle of application which he would give this fact of the criminality of Paul III.

But let us examine his crimes. He called the Council of Trent. We allow he did; but was this a crime? Did not Martin Luther call for a council? Did he not appeal to a council? Was it then a crime to call the council? As for the other charges, we deny the truth of each and every one of them. Indeed, in his second publication, the accuser himself begins to be less confident than in his first edition, for in the second he modestly asks:

"Did not Paul the Third, who called the Council of Trent, prostitute his sister, commit incest with his daughter, and poison her husband, and attempt the chastity of his niece? and was he not also accused of being a necromancer and a sorcerer?"

Here the charge of calling the Council of Trent is abandoned, for the fact is put descriptively, not accusatively; the being found in the fact with his neice, and marked by her husband, are altogether omitted, and the charges of necromancy and sorcery given up; for he only asks, was he not accused of being a necromancer and a sorcerer? We answer, yes, he was accused of it by the man in the Patent Office in Washington, but not by any other person that we have known, heard, or read of,—not even by his friend Mosheim, nor by Collier; but there is a vast difference between being accused of a crime and having committed that crime. Now it is true that Paul III. was accused of those crimes, but it is untrue that he committed them.

What are the facts? Alexander Farnese, dean of the College of Cardinals, was at the age of 68 years chosen Pope, on the 12th of October, 1534, and took the name of Paul III. When he was a young man he erred, and had two children, one of them a son named Pietro Luigi, who at the time of his father's promotion had a son 14 years of age. He committed two other faults after his promotion, one the raising of this boy to the cardinalate, the other the raising of his sister's son to the same dignity at a very unripe age. With these exceptions, we can find

nothing else on record against him. On the contrary, during forty years that he was cardinal, his conduct was such as to procure him esteem from every one; and by his many services he repaired, as far as he could, the crimes which we have stated him to have committed in his youth. And if he created two cardinals at an early age, from family motives, which were unjustifiable, he created sixty-nine, most of whom were men of virtue and learning. The Pope Clement VIII., his immediate predecessor, on his death-bed, recommended to the cardinals this man as his successor, from his high opinion of his qualifications. We shall now quote the words of a Protestant biographical compiler, to show the foundation of the charges against him.

"Maclaine, in a note to his translation of Mosheim, mentions some shocking instances of the licentious and criminal exploits with which Paul was reproached before his death, under the name of Ochino.

"Onuphrius says that he was well versed in most branches of literature, and a generous encourager of learned men. He wrote a comment upon Cicero's *Epistles to Atticus,* before his promotion to the pontificate, and after it some letters, in a polite Latin style, to his friend Cardinal Sadolat, and to Erasmus."

The note which Maclaine appended to his translation of Mosheim, states that some writer published a book, under the title of Ochino, in which Paul was accused of those acts of profligacy. Now a writer in Washington has published that he was a necromancer, and an anonymous writer has libelled him before his death, and others after. Now we ask, in the name of common sense, is this proof? Cardinal Quiri, in a work published in 1745, has repelled and refuted these calumnies, the falsehood of which was so well known when first published as to require no answer, but which, lying for some time in print, were afterwards quoted as fact, and produced as proof. We need not inform our readers that a lie written, and printed, and laid by, will not become truth, though it may become musty.

It is so with those charges—they are musty falsehoods reproduced, and frequently repeated; but repetition of a falsehood will not make it truth.

Paul III, was not a devil incarnate, though he was neither impeccable nor infallible. He was one of those men whose life exhibits the weakness of nature, and the strength of grace. He committed some faults, of which he repented, and perhaps obtained pardon from his Redeemer, and he had many virtues, which caused him to be respected. His faults were few, his virtues many; he has been calumniated, but he was not innocent.

The next Pope whom we call from his grave to be arraigned be-

fore the American public, is Julius III. His indictment is in the following words:

"Julius the Third gave a cardinal's hat to a sodomitical boy, called Innocentius; in his time Casa, Archbishop of Bonaventum, wrote a book in defence of sodomy. Died in 1555. A pious pair."

We perceive that, in his second edition of the charges, this has been omitted by this advocate of virtue, who has indeed made us blush. We have not blushed for crimes committed, but for being obliged to stain our pages with the vile phraseology of a writer, who pays as little regard to decency as to truth. Could he not find some other expression less gross, less revolting, in which to describe the criminality which he imputes to this Pope? No! but, as if he delighted in placing before the eyes of his readers the most filthy expressions, he has, in his descriptions, selected the most offensive which the vocabulary of baseness contained. We do avow, that we have hesitated and reflected, and have had a conflict with our feelings, before we could determine upon proceeding with the examination; but the result was, we thought that, however unworthy of notice the writer might be, and however disgusting his collection, still, were we silent, the charges would be received as admitted, and a religion of purity would be sullied, in the eye of the uninformed, with the filth which had been flung upon it by even such a being as our present assailant. Thus, however painful the task, we were forced to discharge our duty.

Suppose Julius III. was really the monster he describes, does it follow that the Catholic religion taught him to commit those crimes? The charge which this man brings forward with most virulence against the Roman Catholic Church, is that of having established the Inquisition. What would this accuser say, should we prove to him that this tribunal was first established to extirpate this very crime; and that the very criminals who at the time destroyed morality, and nearly disjointed society, were those persons who first established the old Protestant principle in Europe? Yet we would be far from saying that the crime was a part of their religion. The Bugari were some of the first patriarchs of the old Protestant principle. They have left their name as an inheritance. Shall we go on? Roman Catholic princes, not the Roman Catholic Church, established a new tribunal to inquire for them, and to punish them. This was the origin of the Inquisition; and yet we are charged with our religion being the cause of the crime, when its existence is traced to those who established the principle which is opposed to us, and when they, whose principles of religion agree with ours, are known to have been its most strenuous opponents.

Would we not be more warranted in saying that this crime was the consequence of the old Protestant principle? God forbid, however, that we should be so unjust. "But these crimes are indeed no more than what might be expected from such a system of religion." How, then, did it happen that their appearance in Europe is found to correspond exactly with the period of the introduction of this favourite principle, and the prevalence to be confined almost exclusively at the time to the abettors and supporters of that principle? and how does it happen that the punishers of those crimes were the very persons who upheld the system?

But, to return to Julius III., we deny that he ever raised a criminal boy, named Innocentius, to the cardinalate; and we assert that neither the man in Washington, nor any other person in existence, can prove that he did.

Julius was one of those Popes who was not remarkable for virtue, and whose administration was more negligent and unbecoming than was edifying. In the early part of his Papacy, he raised to the cardinalate, from a menial station, a young man named Innocentius. No rational motive for this promotion was assigned or discoverable; and as conjecture is ever busy, and scandal easily propagated, a report was soon current that, perhaps, as the youth was handsome, the Pope had his private reasons for the promotion. The writer in Washington takes his assertion from Maclaine's note upon Mosheim, where he refers to Thaunus, Hoffing, and Sleidan, neither of whom gives more than surmise, founded upon a groundless report, the origin of which we have seen. What, then, are the facts? Julius, without any rational or assigned motive, raised from a low station, to a place of eminent dignity, a handsome boy. A malicious conjecture is hazarded, that perhaps he had his private reasons for doing so. These, and these only, are the facts. Now let us see the process of reasoning. Maclaine asserts, without any proof, that this boy was the object of the criminality of Julius; and a man in Washington says, "therefore the idea of one holy, just, and good God, was almost obliterated from the Christian world." From such logic may common sense protect us.

But Casa, Archbishop of Bonaventum, wrote a book in defence of the crime. If he did, it was badly done. We can only say, the assertion is new to us. When proof is adduced, we shall examine it; but until then we shall beg leave to say that we do not believe the assertion. It is like one made by the London *Morning Chronicle*, a few months past, that the Jesuits were now become venders of obscene paintings and pic-

tures in Europe. We have not heard whether they have opened a store for the purpose as yet in Georgetown or in Washington.

We continue our trial of the accused Popes.

"Bonifacius VII. stole the church ornaments and treasure, and fled to Constantinople. An honest church."

This charge is altogether omitted in the second edition. We do acknowledge that Bonifacius VII. did steal the church ornaments and treasure, and fly to Constantinople. What then? Was it the church that stole them? Though Boniface was a robber, yet the church might be honest. He was a robber,—he was more, he was a cruel murderer,—but he was not a Pope. He was an ambitious, unprincipled man, who, in troublesome times, by simony and corruption, made a party for himself upon the death of Donus II. in 975; but not being received nor acknowledged, and finding the public voice, as well as the regular authority of the church opposed to him, he plundered the church of St. Peter and fled to Constantinople, "where he only tarried till, by the sale of what he had sacrilegiously got, he had amassed vast sums of money, with which he returns to Rome, not doubting by the help of that to retrieve his dignity, by bribing citizens. Here he met with opposition from all good men, but especially from John, a cardinal deacon." This John was not consecrated, but was to be consecrated as successor to Donus. Boniface having hired some ruffians, had John siezed upon, and his eyes put out; "but his enemies increasing about him, and finding his attempts to keep the Papal chair fruitless, whether for fear, or remorse of his great wickedness, this author of many mischiefs miserably died."

Boniface, then, was a wicked man, who strove to be Pope, but who could not—and since he could not, did much mischief. With what justice, then, can he be ranked amongst the Popes, and his guilt charged upon that church which opposed and rejected him for his criminality?

"Johannes XVII. was given to magic. He died in 1003. Very pious indeed."

If a comet appearing, which caused many conjectures during the short period of his pontificate, be a ground for charging the Pope with being given to magic, the charge appears to be well founded. But, in all the records that remain of his acts, and they are not generally creditable to his memory, this charge is not found. If it was not invented in the patent office in Washington, it was invented somewhere else.

John XVII. was not given to magic, but to what is perhaps as bad, to avarice, and to enriching his relations. But this is no peculiarity of Popes or of Roman Catholics.

"Paulus I., who died in 772, excommunicated the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, and was an honourer of St. Petronella, the daughter of St. Peter. Very good."

For our own part, we do not think it a crime for a Pope to excommunicate any man who deserves it; and if he had so much human respect, or, as others would call it, "man pleasing," as to abstain from discharging his duty, because Constantine was an emperor, he would be unfit for his office.

Neither do we think it a crime to honour the saints, or to pay due respect and veneration to their relics.

Now, what are the facts respecting Paul?

He was unanimously chosen Pope for his eminent virtue—he "was a person of an extraordinary meek and merciful temper, and who, in imitation of our Saviour, never returned to any man evil for evil,—but, on the contrary, by doing good to them, he often overcame those men that had injured him. He was of so kind and compassionate a nature, as that he would go about by night, with only two or three attendants, to the houses of poor sick people, assisting them with his counsel, and relieving them with his alms. He also frequently visited the prisons, and paying their creditors, discharged thence multitudes of poor debtors. The fatherless and widows that were overreached by the tribes of lawyers, he defended with his authority, and supported by his charity."

Such is the account given by Protestant editors, of this Pope, whom the defender of Unitarianism, and the assailant of Catholics, places upon a list which, he says, "would disgrace the calendar of Newgate."

But all of this is of no use, because he excommunicates Constantine Copronymus. Did not another Paul, the Apostle of nations, excommunicate the criminal Corinthian? But of what was the emperor guilty? Of Iconoclasm. He held part of what this writer would call the old Protestant principle. He and his partisans began to break down and tear out from the churches the images which had always formed a part of their ornaments; and the Pope sent nuncios to Constantinople, to remonstrate against this his misconduct, and to request he would desist from his sacrilege—and to threaten that, if he continued his spoliations, he should be excommunicated. Constantine had done more,—he had Constantine, the Patriarch of Constantinople, put to death for having opposed his innovations; and had violently intruded Nicetas, the eunuch, who was one of his sacrilegious partisans, into the patriarchial chair. Instead of listening to the admonitions of the good Pope, and desisting from his innovations, the emperor endeavoured to strengthen his party, by associating in his throne his son Leo IV., whom he had married to

the beautiful Irene; and by making peace with the King of Bulgaria, upon condition that he should aid in iconoclasm; and by making a league with the Saracens, that he might have, if necessary the Mahometan power to oppose Christendom, and thus caused this relentless race to conceive the first hopes of making themselves masters of Europe, and extinguishing the Christian religion. He made a similar league with the pagan Saxons, who were to furnish him three hundred horsemen against the Catholics. Yet there is no record of Paul having carried his threat into execution, by actually excommunicating the emperor.

If the man in Washington knew a particle of history, he would not have written as he did. Religion has no greater enemy, nor one whom it is more difficult to convince, or to refute, than a self-sufficient, ignorant writer, who skims the surface of the productions of sophists, to catch the filthy, frothy scum with which they abound, and in his rage for controversy, to fling it upon his opponents. There is, however, a consolation in reflecting, that although they may cause a temporary misconception, they can do no lasting injury.

As to the charge of Paul's honouring St. Petronella, we admit the fact, but deny its criminality; but this is not the moment in which we choose to enter upon our vindication of the doctrine of honouring the saints. We shall take it up in its proper place; meantime, as St. Petronella has been introduced, we may, perhaps, as well conclude our present remarks by giving a short account of her.

"Amongst the disciples of the Apostles in the primitive age of saints, this holy virgin shone as a bright star in the church. She lived when Christians were more solicitous to live well, than to write much; they knew how to die for Christ, but did not compile long books or disputations, in which vanity has often a greater share than charity. Hence, no particular account of her actions has been transmitted down to us. But how eminent her sanctity was, we may judge from the lustre by which it was distinguished among the apostles, prophets, and martyrs. Her name is the feminine and dimunitive of Peter, and she is said to have been a daughter of the Apostle St. Peter; which tradition is confirmed by certain writings quoted by the Manichees, in the time of St. Austin, which affirm that St. Peter had a daughter, whom he cured of a palsy.

"That St. Peter was married before his vocation to the apostleship, we learn from the Gospel; though St. Jerome and other ancient fathers testify, that he lived in continency after his call. St. Clement of Alexandria assures us, that his wife attained to the glory of martyrdom;

at which that Apostle himself encouraged her, bidding her to remember our Lord,—but, it seems not certain whether St. Petronella was more than the spiritual daughter of that Apostle. She flourished at Rome, and was buried on the way to Ardea, where anciently a cemetery and a church bore her name, so famous, that in it a station or place for the assembly of the city in public prayers was established by Gregory III. She is commemorated in the true martyrology of Bede, in those which bear the name of St. Jerome."

We are getting through the heavy Newgate Calendar which "The Writer in Washington" has compiled, as quickly as we can, without giving our readers too much at one time.

"Bonifacius the Eighth, by a general bull, exempted the clergy in all countries from paying taxes, and so forth, to princes."—Justice.

Now, in the name of common sense, is this in America considered a crime? What was the origin of our revolution? A successful resistance to a tax demanded by a prince. The fathers of a revolution exempted all their fellow-countrymen from paying taxes, and so forth, to princes—not by bulls, but by bullets. And as the Washington man will not allow the Pope a patent to use a bullet, it is ungenerous to prevent his using a bull. Were the Hancocks, the Carrolls, the Jeffersons, the Adams, the Monroes, guilty of injustice? But to be serious: Is the exemption of the clergy from taxation a crime? Will Mr. Elliott inform us of the name of that state in this Union in which the clergy are taxed? Then are all the states of the Union unjust, for they have all by a general law, which is nothing but a general bull, exempted the clergy from taxation. It is one of the misfortunes of a person who thoughtlessly lashes at everything which he imagines to be a fault in a person whom he dislikes, to whip himself.

But though states may exempt from taxes the clergy or any other particular portion of their inhabitants, surely the Pope has no such authority outside his own dominions. To the truth of this proposition we give our most cordial assent, and were we to plead in this country to the collector of the taxes the bull of a Pope, it would be justly a subject of ridicule. The Congress of the Union, and the legislatures of the several states, and they alone, have the right to impose taxes upon the clergy and laity of this republic, or to exempt them from the payment of the same. And the sovereign princes or legislatures of the several independent states of Christendom, and they only, always have had this right so far as their own subjects or citizens were concerned, and if they suffered Pope or prelate to interfere with this right, it was their own

fault. Boniface might have recommended to the sovereigns to grant the exemption, and they might have complied; but Boniface could not order, and if he did, his order was of no avail in the sight of God or man. The Roman Catholic Church does not teach that the Pope has any temporal power, and this is a manifest exercise of temporal dominion. Now we can find no such bull of Boniface on record. But we do not, therefore, hold Boniface to have been guiltless. He was ambitious and arrogant; and though a man of learning and ability, and many other good qualities, he was far from being a good Pope.[31] But it does not, therefore, follow that the church is unjust.

"Julius II., more a soldier than a prelate, passing over a bridge of the Tiber, threw his key into the river and brandished his sword. Excommunicated Louis of France. Died in 1513. A very meek Christian, indeed."

That Julius was a good Pope, we are far from asserting. That he was more a soldier than a prelate, we deny, for he was equally both. That his acts were more becoming a soldier and a king than a bishop, we admit. That he left Rome at the head of his army to regain a portion of his territory, of which his neighbours attempted to rob him, we admit. That he threw his key into the Tiber, we have no proof. That he brandished his sword, is equally devoid of proof. That he excommunicated the King of France, is a fact; and it is equally a fact that, previous thereto, the King of France had published within his dominions the act of an ecclesiastical club calling itself a council, at Pisa, which pronounced sentence of deposition against Julius.

Julius was a bad Pope. Does it follow that, therefore, the idea of one holy, just, and good God, was almost obliterated from the world?

"Pius II., an Italian, approved the marriage of the clergy, and turned out numerous cloistered nuns. The consistent church. Died in 1648."

It is stated of this Pope, that he repeated as a maxim, "that there was great reason for prohibiting the priests to marry, but greater for allowing it again." But, by reading the Washington man's charge, one would imagine that some mighty inconsistency had been discovered in the Roman Catholic Church—some palpable contradiction in faith or morals. Yet, what is the fact? The celibacy of the clergy is not an article of faith which is unchangeable, nor a principle of morality which is always essentially the same; but it is a practice of discipline that is liable to variation. There is no inconsistency then in changing, for reasonable and sufficient causes, discipline which must always be accommodated to the circumstances of time and place; but there would be

[31] Since the time the above was written historic research has cleared the memory of this great Pontiff from the cloud of accusations brought against him by Gallican writers and by a hostile party at his own court.—S. G. M.

great inconsistency and glaring absurdity, in changing doctrines of faith and principles of morality. For if it be true, at any given moment, that God revealed a certain proposition, it must continue for ever a truth, that he did make such revelation, and no change of time or circumstances can ever afterwards make it untrue, that God did make that special revelation. Hence, the doctrines of faith which are expressed by those propositions, never can be changed. No improvement in science, no increasing light of knowledge, no discovery of chemistry, or exhibition of new planets, or measuring of distances, or changing of forms of civil government, can make it untrue that God made such a revelation. Thus, doctrine is irreformable—and as the principles of morality or equally unchangeable as God or truth, they are irreformable. We shall submit to the charge of inconsistency when it shall be shown, that the Roman Catholic Church denied the truth of any doctrine of faith or principle of morality, once promulgated by her. But her discipline changes frequently. The celibacy of the clergy is matter of discipline. Pius II said it would be well to change it, but he did not change it—nor could any individual of his own mere will, change a general law of the church —and the discipline is now what it has been from the beginning. Where is the inconsistency? Even were it changed, there would be no inconsistency; much less is there when no change has taken place; and highly as we respect the opinion and character of Pius, we differ widely in opinion with him upon this subject.

The Washington man himself is not so squeamish for consistency in discipline. We should believe he would have no objection to a good black pudding in the moment of his hunger; and yet, even Griesbach acknowledges, that the Apostles commanded the Christians not to eat blood. What a fine quality is this consistency!! How beautiful is the light of increasing science. How does it patch up holes in the memory and repair sieves? Does the man in Washington call in the priests or the elders of the church, to pray over the sick person, anointing him with oil? "The consistent church." Does the man in Washington go about breaking bread from house to house, and taking his meat with gladness and simplicity of heart? "The consistent church." Does the man in Washington sell his possessions and lay the price at the feet of the Apostles? "The consistent church."

That the Pope "turned out numerous cloistered nuns," or one cloistered nun, we deny. Let us have the names and the proofs. We find assertions repeated, but no proofs. So with the editor of the *Unitarian Miscellany*, who asserted in his eighteenth number, that the councils of the Roman Catholic Church were notorious for repealing the decrees of

each other. He made the assertion with all the confidence of truth. "Curiosity" asked him to point out one general council which repealed any decision of faith ever made by a former general council. Yet, three months have passed away and no answer has been given to the question. Three years may pass away in like manner. We now pledge ourselves before the world, that we will publicly renounce the Roman Catholic faith and become Deists, if there be exhibited a genuine decree of any general council of the Roman Catholic Church, upon a doctrine of faith, which contradicts any other genuine decree of a general council of the Roman Catholic Church, upon a doctrine of faith. So much for consistency.

"Formosus the First, who died in 897, was so hated by Stephen, that his body was unburied, and all his acts reversed; two of his fingers cut off, and then buried among the laity. Sergius the Third took him up again, caused his head to be cut off, and his body thrown into the Tiber—by a forgiving church!

"Romanus the First, made void all the decrees and acts of Stephen, who was before him; and Johannes the Ninth, restored the acts of Formosus. Sergius the Third, who died in 909, rescinded the acts of Formosus. So much for the infallibility of Popes."

This is in his first publication of July 20. In his second publication of August 21, he says:

"By a review of the statement, we find that this pretended infallible church was very often inconsistent with itself, for the acts of Formosus the First were rescinded by Stephen and by Sergius; afterwards the decrees of Stephen were made null by Romanus; and Johannes restored those of Formosus:—then again these were rescinded by Sergius the Third. And Pius the Second (one of the most rational) differed from most other Popes, by allowing the clergy to marry, and turning out the cloistered nuns."

In our issue published on the 21st of August, [*Sup.* p. 443,] we proved the inconclusiveness of this sophistry, because we showed that even if Roman Catholics believed the Pope to be infallible in his doctrinal decisions, and his decisions upon the principles of morality, the facts here charged not being decisions, either upon doctrine of belief or practice, but being special acts of an individual, would not, even if true to their full extent, be a destruction of the principle of supposed Catholic faith—for the argument founded upon the facts in such a case would be this: "Roman Catholics believe the Pope to be infallible in his decisions upon what is faith, and what is a correct principle of morality. But some of those Popes rescinded the decrees of other Popes." Now, before we come to the conclusion, we must ask, "Were those rescinded decrees decisions upon faith, or upon principles of morality," for if they were not, we can arrive at no conclusion. There is

another question also which is very material: "Were those men Popes?" for if they were not, there can be no conclusion.

First, it is a notorious fact, that those decrees did not regard faith or principles of morality; and next, some of the persons here represented as Popes were not Popes; and thirdly, even though the decrees did regard faith or principles of morality, and though those persons had been really Popes, the Roman Catholic Church does not teach that they were infallible; and lastly, nothing can be more unjust, than to charge upon the whole church the acts of those individuals.

The acts of those persons will be best considered by examining their history.

Formosus, Bishop of Porto, was appointed Pope in the year 891. He was the first bishop who was chosen to that dignity, and he was, one account informs us, chosen through means of undue influence; another account states, by reason of his learning and virtue. At present it matters little which account is true, nor have we the means of deciding; but we know the fact, that he was universally acknowledged and obeyed, and is one of those whom we acknowledge to have been Pope. He was not consecrated, as, having been already a bishop, but was regularly inducted and enthroned. He died in 897, having governed the church five years and six months.

After his death there was considerable disturbance in consequence of the contention of two parties, each seeking to promote its own favourite. Those favourites were Sergius and Boniface VI. Some historians assert that Boniface was canonically elected, but he died within the first month, and his name is not found registered as a regular Pope. Sergius is here registered as an anti-Pope or unwarranted pretender.

Stephen VI., Bishop of Anagni, next succeeded. He had undisguised hatred to the memory of Formosus after his death, as he conceived himself injured by him when alive. Stephen is, on all hands, allowed to have been a vindictive, unprincipled man. He had the body of Formosus disinterred, a mock trial proceeded upon in presence of the carcass, sentence of degradation passed, the body divested of the pontificial ornaments, wrapped up in a secular dress, and the two first fingers of the right hand cut off, and the corpse buried in a separate place from that in which the Popes were interred. He even sacrilegiously reordained those who had been ordained by Formosus, and rescinded his acts of appointment to any officer or place, decreeing that Formosus was an usurper, and that his acts were null and void.

Stephen was a bad man, who made an atrocious display of the worst passions, in a most disgusting and sacrilegious manner. But was this a

decision upon an article of faith, or upon a principle of morality? Did the church which had the misfortune and the affliction of seeing him elevated to her first seat of dignity and authority, teach him these acts? No. In the very age that this cruel and base man was thus disgracefully employed, several of the bishops and other members of that church, an Alcuin in England, a Rabanus Maurus in Mayence, St. Paulinus in Aquileia, St. Ludger in Saxony, St. Benedict in Cleves, Hincmar of Rheims, Theodulph of Orleans, Lupus of Ferriers, Amolar, Remigius and Florus of Lyons, Alfred the Great of England, Isidor Mercator, Anastasius the Librarian, Theodore the Studite, and thousands of others, were ornamenting the church by their learning, edifying it by their virtue, explaining and enforcing its doctrines, preserving its deposit of faith and morality, and though Italy was, during a considerable portion of this age, a prey to faction, and the Papal See an object of human ambition, still, with the exception of the few latter years of this century, the chair of St. Peter had been filled by men whose conduct fitted them for the station, and in those latter years the evils arose from the violent interference of the laity in church concerns, and from the incursions of infidels and the ravages of self-called Catholics in Italy. Thus the idea of one holy, just and good God was not banished from the world, though Pope Stephen VI and some other Popes were criminals.

Stephen having within the first year after his elevation been strangled in prison, Romanus was violently forced by a party into the administration; he is not recognised as a Pope, though his acts of administration were not incorrect. Theodore II., who succeeded, declared the acts of Formosus to have been regular, and his condemnation by Stephen to have been irregular; he accordingly ordered all those whom Stephen had deprived to be restored. So that as yet we have but the acts of Stephen irregular. Theodore died within the first month of his Pontificate, and was succeeded by John XI. who confirmed the acts of Theodore, approving the decision regarding Formosus, and repealing the irregularities of Stephen. Benedict IV. succeeded to John, who died in 900. Benedict was a man admired and esteemed for his virtue, especially for his care of the poor. He died in 903, and was succeeded by Leo V. who, within a few months, was driven from his see and thrown into prison by one Christopher, who had made a party to carry for him by force what he could not regularly obtain. This intruder was never recognised by the church. After a few months of tumult he died, and his victim having also died, one of those unfortunate men who had long aspired to the dignity, but who in the lifetime of Formosus had been opposed by him, succeeded, and Sergius III. who, like Stephen VI., cherished the same

feelings of hatred against the memory of Formosus, imitated the misconduct of Stephen, and repeated the disgusting and sickening and barbarous scene. Well indeed might the enemy of Catholicity exhibit this wretch to the world as a devil incarnate. Now, in the year 906, did he exhibit to disgusted Christendom the first instance of a Pope given to revenge and lust.

We acknowledge that he was a Pope—we avow that he was a criminal; but we assert, that his criminality neither destroyed the truth of the doctrines of that church which wept under his administration, nor deprive the office which he so unworthily filled of a particle of its authority. The Catholic Church never taught that he or any other Pope was infallible, and glaring evidence convinces the world that he was not impeccable.

In our issue published on the 2d of October, we answered that part of the charge which relates to Pius II. [*Sup.* 459.] We now sum up the rest.

There were two wicked men, Stephen VI. and Sergius III., who, at different times within ten years, got into the Papacy. They hated the memory of Formosus, one of their predecessors, whose conduct is not complained of—they deprived those whom he had appointed to offices—they sacrilegiously reordained or ejected those whom he had ordained—they did everything in their power to disgrace his memory, and they moreover treated his dead body with indignity. The other Popes reversed the wicked acts and decrees of those two. This is the plain enumeration of the facts, the statement which we find. Is it a good conclusion from those premises to infer, Therefore, a general council of the Roman Catholic Church is not infallible?

But, how did it happen that those wicked men were elevated to the papal dignity? From the same cause that has produced most of the disasters of the church. The unwarrantable interference of the laity with church government. Many of the kings and states which professed the Catholic religion, without practising its duties, usurped the power of making ecclesiastical appointments, and found some clergymen weak, and others wicked; and by force and fraud they raised to the dignities, and the possession of the temporalities, their unprincipled adherents; and whilst this system lasted, the church saw desolation and profligacy which she could not remedy, and abuses were introduced, which the repeated efforts of successive ages, and the zealous exertions of the most holy Popes and bishops were not able fully to remove; and in reviewing church history, we have always found the same cause produce the same effect. The church never saw a bad Pope until after she had witnessed

the interference of princes and other laymen in her concerns. The disorders began at Constantinople, when the laity interfered; and corruption and crime were unknown at Rome until the laity interfered.

We proceed in the trial of the accused Popes.

"Johannes the Eleventh, who died in 936, was a wicked, cruel, libidinous man; was taken in adultery, and slain by the husband of the woman. He is said to have poisoned 200 persons, among whom were Leo and Stephen, his predecessors. A pretty representative of St. Peter."—*Washington Gazette* of July 20.

"Was not Johannes the Eleventh an adulterer, and killed by the husband of the woman with whom he cohabited? He also stands accused of poisoning 200 persons, among whom were his two predecessors, Leo and Stephen."—*Same paper* of Aug. 20.

The short answer to this double assertion might truly be "false," because John the Eleventh, who died in 936, was not a libidinous man, was not taken in aduletry, was not killed by the husband of the woman with whom he had been guilty.

But we do not wish to leave the facts unexplained, which the ignorance of the writer has thrown into confusion. There was a John to whom part of this accusation might apply, John the Twelfth, and he died in 964. Thus, we wish not to take the advantage afforded us by the want of historical knowledge of the calumniator of our church.

But we before stated that it was no part of our creed that the Popes were impeccable; and we before proved that the criminal conduct of Popes was no more an argument against the truth of the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, than the crimes of Judas would be against the mission of the Apostles.

This unhappy epoch of our history exhibits, in glaring colours, the effects of lay interference in ecclesiastical concerns. This is that period of which Cardinal Baronius, and the worthy Genebrard, the learned Archbishop of Aix, write, that "the promotion of wicked men to the pontificate cannot be charged as a crime upon the church, neither can we be reproached with their immorality; for although the church was under the necessity of yielding for a time to inevitable necessity, she always protested against the irregularity of usurpations, which produced incalculable evils. The intermeddling and tyranny of princes, and the introduction of physical force, especially by the factious chieftains who then ravaged and distracted Italy, sometimes enabled unworthy and profligate men to occupy the chair of the Sovereign Pontiff. Ambition and bribery were generally the recommendations which those despots most regarded."

The German princes were called upon to oppose the Italian tyrants;

but though they for a time conducted themselves with moderation, they, too, sought to domineer in their turn. Little need we wonder, then, at the scenes which are presented to us, when in this age, though we find some excellent and virtuous men filling the Papal chair, we also find it occupied by notorious profligates; and though their number be comparatively few, still one ought not to have been tolerated.

During the pontificate of Agapetus II. a good and holy man, who died in 956, Berenfarius and his son Albert ravaged a considerable part of Italy, and exercised a most tyrannical sway,—to obviate which, several of the Italian nobles invited Otho, King of Germany, to their aid. Entering Italy with 50,000 men, he overcame the tyrants, and was crowned in Rome as Emperor of Germany. Leaving Berengarius and Albert in the government of a province, he returned to Germany. Some writers confounding dates, have placed those events in the pontificate of John XII. Rome was, at that time, under the temporal government of a man named Alberic, one of the offspring of an infamous but powerful woman named Marozia, by Albert, the father of Guy, Marquis of Tuscany, her first husband. Alberic dying in 954, was succeeded in his office of consul and patrician by his son Octavian, only sixteen years of age; and by intrigue, and corruption, and force, he occupied the Papal chair upon the death of Agapetus in 956. He formed a league with Berengarius and Albert, who aided him against the clergy, and the greater number of the bishops, who protested against this intrusion and consecration of a wicked young profligate of eighteen years of age; but Octavian, who now assumed the name of John XII., found a large party armed for his support, and many of the clergy amongst his adherents. Some of the cardinals invited Otho, who was now in Germany, to return and expel the intruders. John having heard of this, had the cardinals cruelly punished and disfigured. Berengarius and his son were again taken prisoners by Otho, and banished. Otho, who was a religious, holy man, endeavoured to persuade John to a change of life, but the people of Rome exhibited a catalogue of gross crimes against him. He fled from the city as soon as he found a council was likely to be held, and sent an excommunication against those who should assemble. John and his associates plundered the Church of St. Peter. A council was held, at which the proxy of the Patriarch of Aquileia, the Archbishops of Milan, Ravenna, Bremen, and Treves, together with about fifty other bishops, principally Italians and Germans, assisted. They sent the Pope a copy of the charges and a citation, and after the delay of a fortnight another notice, and then proceeded to examine the charges, which being proved, he was deposed, and Leo VIII. consecrated in his stead. This

Pope was anxious to escape the place of trouble and peril to which he was appointed, but was forced to yield. After the emperor's departure, John, placing himself at the head of a strong party, seized upon Rome, and Leo was obliged to fly. The usurper still found a multitude of supporters. Those who adhered to him, after his death set up Benedict V.; but upon the return of Otho, Benedict yielded and swore obedience to Leo,—and accompanying the emperor into Germany, died at Hapsburg, whither he was banished. John, previous to his death, had retired from Rome with his wicked companions; and Leo, urged by the difficulties with which he was surrounded, yielded to Otho a privilege which was very disastrous in its results, the privilege of choosing the Pope, and the right of investiture. It afterwards cost immense trouble to remove the evils which followed this grant.

The mode of John's death is uncertain. Some writers state that he died suddenly, or was struck dead by heaven; others state that he was beaten in such a manner by the husband of a woman with whom he sinned, that he died in consequence; others state that he was stabbed in the criminal act. The Washington man, besides his historical inaccuracy has taken the liberty of adding fictions to facts; for no writer has accused John, as far as we can discover, of having killed 200 persons in any way, or of having poisoned either of his predecessors. Leo VI. died in 929, nine years before John was born. Stephen VII. died in 931. They were two good and religious men, who died natural deaths. Leo VII. died in 939, before John was fully one year old,—and he must be acknowledged to have been a very early proficient in crime, if, at that age, he was guilty of poisoning the Pope.

The next Stephen died in 943, when John was about four years old. This good man was seriously injured and disfigured by the Romans in a tumult when John was about eighteen months old,—and he must have been a very wicked urchin indeed to begin so early if he was the cause of this tumult; and he must also have been a very extraordinary lad to have poisoned a man who died a natural death. Martin II., who succeeded this Stephen, was also a good, holy, meek, charitable prelate, who fed the poor, preserved peace, established religion, and died lamented in 946, not by poison. His successor, Agapetus II., is represented to us also to have been a good, harmless, pious and religious man, who died a natural death in 956, and was succeeded by John. So that, bad as he was, we must acquit him of the crime of the poisoning. Thus, even in the worse days of confusion, we find a succession of good Popes, whose virtues will redeem the profligacy of an intruded criminal whose vices procured his speedy deposition. Was it not then unjust

to say that because this man did, by bad means, obtrude himself for a while upon the church by the force of unprincipled laymen, professing to be members of that church whose laws they despised and violated, that the idea of one holy, just and good God was obliterated from the Christian world?

The next charge is against two Popes:

"Alexander the Third excommunicated the Emperor Frederic I., and obliged him to prostrate himself at his feet, when the Pope trode on his neck. He died in 1181. And Celestinus the Third put the crown on the emperor's head with his feet, and struck it off again, saying, *per me reges regnant.* He died in 1198. Very meek and pious men, no doubt!"—*Washington Gazette,* July 20.

This charge appears to have been abandoned in the second edition, August 20.

We have seen above the manner in which the Emperors of Germany came to have any power of interference in the appointment of Popes. In the year 1046, Henry II., Emperor of Germany, went farther than any of his predecessors, requiring of the electors in Rome an oath, that they would do nothing in the choosing of the Pope, except by his will and determination. Subsequently to this, the clergy of Rome, and sometimes the emperor, and sometimes both conjointly, made the appointment. In 1059, Pope Nicholas II. at a council held in Sutri, ordained, "That if any person by simony, or by the favour of any powerful man, or by any tumult either of the people or soldiery, shall be placed in the chair of St. Peter, he shall be considered not apostolical but apostate, one that transgresses even the rules of common reason; and it shall be lawful for the cardinals, the clergy, and the devout laity, with weapons spiritual and temporal, by anathemas and by human aid, to drive him out, and to depose him; and that if the Catholic people cannot assemble for this purpose in the city of Rome, they may do so where they can with most convenience." Notwithstanding this decree, Henry III. set up Cadolus, an anti-pope, in opposition to Alexander, the successor of Nicholas. After considerable difficulties, Henry, at a council in Mantua, submitted to Alexander, disclaimed all right to interfere in the election, and obtained pardon for himself and Cadolus. Gregory VII. succeeded Alexander, and the Emperor Henry being warned by him to desist from simoniacal practices, and the corruption of churchmen, violently opposed him—they were afterwards reconciled; but Henry setting up new pretensions, went so far as to send one Romandus as a clergyman to Rome, who by the emperor's authority interdicted and suspended the Pope, and summoned the cardinals to appear before the emperor, that he might appoint a new Pope for them. The Pope excommunicated this audacious

and fickle monarch. Some of his subjects rose up against him, and he then sent to sue reconciliation with Gregory. On the 28th of January 1078, he swore obedience to Gregory at Canosso, and swore that he would not molest him in the discharge of his pontifical duties. Henry soon broke through this obligation; and Gregory seeing the mischiefs which arose from simony, especially in a council held at Rome, deposed several convicted thereof, and renewed the ancient canons now falling into disuse, by which any clergyman accepting an ecclesiastical appointment from any layman, or body of laymen, was deposed and degraded. Henry, finding some of his own favourites, and some whom he had himself simoniacally placed in churches, deposed, set up an antipope—this was Gilbert, Archbishop of Ravenna, who had been deposed and degraded for simony, and for fomenting and heading several schisms. Henry, at the head of an army, took this man to Rome, and installed him in the Church of St. Peter, whilst the Pope was besieged in the Castle of St. Angelo. An army coming to the Pope's aid, Henry and his dependant fled from Rome, and Gregory soon after died at Salerno. His successor, Victor III., is supposed to have been poisoned by the contrivance of Henry. This monarch having met several disasters, gave over persecuting the church. But his son Henry IV. succeeding him, marched into Italy, and being admitted into Rome with his army, after a solemn stipulation that he would eject from their places the bishops and other ecclesiastics whom he had unwarrantably and simoniacally placed in several churches, the Pope Paschal II. met him at the porch of St. Peter's Church, and Henry falling down, kissed the Pope's feet, and went into the church. When he was seated, he, contrary to his solemn oath, asked the Pope to confirm all those simoniacal appointments; and upon Paschal's refusal he gave a private signal, the church was filled with his soldiers, and seized the Pope, cardinals, and a considerable number of the clergy, and cast them into prison. He compelled the Pope to sign an act of confirmation before he would release one prisoner, and also promise to crown him next day in St. Peter's Church. After having obtained his ends he returned to Germany.

This same Henry returned to Rome upon the appointment of Gelasius II. and set up an antipope, ordered his soldiers to follow along the bank the galley in which the Pope was escaping, and to shoot him and every person they could see on board, with arrows or javelins, as they could not follow by water. Lotharius, in the pontificate of Innocent II., was crowned emperor after the death of Henry, and relinquished all pretence of interfering in the election of Popes in 1143. In 1155 or 6, Frederic I. was crowned Emperor of Germany by Pope Adrian IV.,

and upon the death of this Pope, in 1159, Alexander III. was chosen; but three cardinals having formed a faction, set up Octavian, an anti-pope. Alexander requested Frederic, who was then in Italy, to aid him in extinguishing the consequent sedition. Frederic knowing well the manner in which things stood, was desirous of any pretext to attempt the revival of the claim for the Emperor of Germany to nominate the Pope, sent word to have both claimants appear before him, and he would judge between them. Alexander, standing upon his right, refused; Octavian was supported by Frederic, who was therefore excommunicated by Alexander. And after a contest of eighteen years, Frederic met Alexander at Venice, and of his own accord made submission to him, of his own accord kissed his feet, and on one occasion held his stirrup to make atonement for all the injury, scandal, and vexation he has caused, and was by Alexander absolved from the censures under which he lay. This took place in 1181, and not 1811, as the printer, not the writer, must have placed it; so that to say Alexander obliged Frederic to do this, is not true, though it is true that Frederic did of his own accord what he thought himself bound in justice to do, for the purpose of repairing the evils he had caused. The Pope's laying his foot on the emperor's neck is a falsehood, which some candid Protestant writers acknowledge, "is not now believed," but was always known to be a gross misrepresentation. Frederic then aided in putting down the rebellious factions in the city of Rome, and saw Alexander placed in quiet in his See.

The whole story of Celestinus III. is from beginning to end a fabrication—no such thing ever has occurred.

The next charge we examine is that made against Boniface III., and through him, against his successors:

"Boniface the Third, who died in 606, obtained of Phocas, the murderer of his lord, the acknowledgement of the supremacy of the Pope on earth. This power was afterwards disclaimed by Sabinianus the First. Very consistent."—*Washington Gazette,* July 20.

"Also, though Bonifacius the Third obtained from Phocas the acknowledgement of the Pope's supremacy on earth, yet Sabinianus afterwards disclaimed this power." —*Same paper,* Aug. 20.

By these two statements one would imagine, 1. That Boniface III. was the first Pope who claimed the supremacy. 2. That he derived this authority from Phocas, who deposed and put to death Maurice, the Emperor of the East, in 602. 3. That Sabinianus was Pope after Boniface. 4. That Sabinianus disclaimed this authority. Yet all these propositions are severally untrue.

Any person at all read in church history, will necessarily perceive that Boniface, who was the sixty-seventh Pope, did not claim from Phocas even any recognition of his title to the supremacy, which was never called in question; nor did Phocas create that dignity, nor bestow that jurisdiction which were held and exercised by several of the predecessors of Boniface in the very city of Constantinople, on several occasions, before the birth of either Phocas or Boniface. Whoever will peruse even the little abstract which we have given of the early history of the Greek Church, under the head of Turkey in Europe, in our last numbers, will find how void of truth is this insinuation, that Boniface was the first Pope whose supremacy was recognised by an Emperor. The supremacy of the Bishop of Rome had been recognised by the Emperor Aurelian 350 years before this period, though Aurelian was a pagan; and the supremacy was claimed by every Bishop of Rome, and exercised by every Bishop of Rome from St. Peter down to Boniface III. Thus, the second insinuation must also be untrue, that it was from Phocas this authority was derived.

The application on the part of Boniface was to restrain the Bishop of Constantinople from using a new title, which would imply an additional right to the several privileges which had already been usurped by that See. Gregory the Great immediately opposed this attempt at usurpation, and Boniface did no more.

The third proposition is a gross historical blunder. Sabinianus was the immediate successor of St. Gregory in the Papacy; he came to the chair in 604, and lived, after his elevation, not quite four months. There was a vacancy of nearly a year before Boniface III. succeeded to Simplicianus, so that the third proposition is destitute of truth. The fourth proposition is without any foundation in fact. In the first place, Simplicianus, who was dead before Boniface obtained the order of Phocas, could not have disclaimed the power supposed to be granted thereby to Boniface afterwards, unless he were to have been resuscitated, of which we have no evidence; and in the next place, Simplicianus, during his short pontificate, made no declaration in any way upon the subject.

This topic of the supremacy granted by Phocas to Boniface, is one upon which much is said by ignorant declaimers, and much has been written by uncandid or uninformed compilers; but from a fair examination of facts, the truth will always be discovered.

The next charge is against a very bad man:

"Benedictus the Ninth was a conjuror; and with Laurence and Gracœan, two cardinals, used to wander in the woods, to invoke the devils and bewitch women

to follow them. He died in 1045. Such was the piety of his time.''—*Washington Gazette,* July 20.

''Was not Benedictus the Ninth a conjuror, who pretended to understand the magic art, and to bewitch women?''—*Same paper,* Aug. 20.

This unfortunate young man was extremely wicked. He was intruded by the factious laity, who at this time, as we have before observed, usurped by force what they could not obtain by the laws of God; and in their selections we find the dreadful consequences of their criminal aggresions. By force and violence, at a period of extreme youth, Theophilact, the nephew of Pope John XIX., was made his successor. Except from the writer in Washington, we know nothing of his progress in the art magic, of his having cardinals for the companions of his crimes, or of his bewitching women, or invoking devils. But history informs us that his crimes caused his ejection; and that by simony, John, Bishop of Sabinum, who took the name of Sylvester III., got into his place. Benedict's friends put him out by force; and soon afterwards the church was freed from them both, and Gregory VI. occupied their place. This man was pious and well-disposed,—but the dreadful state of Italy placed him under the necessity of defending even the very churches with an army, and at the Council of Sutri he submitted the examination of his case to the synod; at their desire he resigned. Benedict and Sylvester were declared to heve been always irregular intruders, and Clement II. was prevailed upon to assume the government of the church. Why, then, would the writer in Washington adduce the misconduct of a man who was condemned by both clergy and laity as a criminal, as the standard by which he would estimate the piety of the age which condemned him as impious? Is this candour? Is this religion?

In the character of Alexander VI. we thought, at least, we should be able to agree with the man who signed himself Auditor:

''Alexander the Sixth was incestuous with his own daughter. He died in 1503, by poison, which was given to him by mistake, instead of some of the cardinals whom he had invited to an entertainment. Monstrous!''—*Washington Gazette,* July 20.

''Did not Alexander the Sixth commit incest with his own daughter? This monstrous villain designed to poison several cardinals whom he invited to an entertainment; but the poison, as in the case of Hamlet, was given by mistake to himself.'' —*Same paper,* Aug. 20.

Had the writer stated Alexander the Sixth to have been one of the greatest villains and most profligate men that ever existed, a notorious hypocrite, and a man of consummate ability, who met a horrid fate, which he richly deserved, in all this we would have acquiesced. But the first charge made upon him we are not prepared to admit,—not because we consider him incapable of such a crime, but because we find

no testimony to support it. The history of Alexander's crimes would fill all the columns of our paper; but the crimes of ten or twelve Popes, selected from amongst 250, do not constitute the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.

We shall conclude our present examination with Martin IV.

"Martinus the Fourth, a Frenchman, kept the concubine of his predecessor, Nicholas; removed all the pictures of bears from the palace, lest his concubine should bring forth one. Died in 1285. O, Chastity!"—*Washington Gazette,* July 20.

"Was not Martinus the Fourth also an adulterer, who kept the concubine of his predecessor, Nicholas; and had all the pictures of bears removed from the palace, lest she should bring forth one?"—*Same paper,* Aug. 20.

We have ransacked the history of this Pope in every author, Catholic and Protestant, that lay within our reach; we have read the history of every Pope of the same name, and of several other Popes, under the impression that so gross a charge could not be made by the most impudent defamer, without some semblance of foundation in fact; but we were disappointed. The predecessor of Martin is accurately designated, and the charge inculpates them both. We can only say, that never have we found more exact concurrent testimony of writers of different religions and interests, than in the attestation that those two calumniated Popes, Nicholas III. and Martin IV., were men of unblemished morality, and especially remarkable for their chaste and modest demeanour. What, then, could have tempted the writer in Washington to make so false a charge upon both?

Martin interfered, perhaps, too much in temporal concerns; but there was much excuse for his interference.

The next charge brought forward by "The Writer in Washington" is that of persecution.

"Pelagius the First, who died in 559, ordained that schismatics and heretics should be punished with temporal death. Yet the Scriptures say, judge no man," and so forth.

"Martinus the Fifth condemned Wickliff, and burned John Huss and Jerome of Prague, his followers. Died in 1431. The mercy and justice of the church!"

"Gregorius the Thirteenth, a Bononian, altered the calendar. He contrived the massacre of the Protestants at Paris. Died 1585."

"Gregorius the Fifteenth, a Bononian, instigated the French against Protestants, sainted Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Inquisition and the Jesuits. Most pious indeed."—*Washington City Gazette,* July 20.

"Did not Gregorius the Thirteenth, who altered the calendar, contrive the massacre of the Protestants at Paris? And did not Gregorius the Fifteenth, the patron of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the society of the Jesuits, introduce the bloody Inquisition, wherever he had sufficient influence?"—*Same paper,* Aug. 20.

Before we proceed to examine the charges themselves, it will not be

amiss to remark upon some palpable inaccuracies, which exhibit how little this writer knows of the facts which he comments upon and misrepresents. In the first place, St. Ignatius of Loyola was not born until the year 1491, and the origin of the Inquisition is carried at least back to the year 1184, when in a provincial council of Verona it was decreed, that bishops ought to make diligent inquisition after heretics in their diocesses, and having detected them, cause them to be delivered up to the civil magistrate, to be treated according to law. The first person who held the office of Inquisitor-General, was Peter of Castelnau, a papal legate, in the year 1204. Ranier and Guy, two Cistertian monks, were commissioned in 1198, in Languedoc, to inquire for the Albigenses, and denounce them to the secular power. The first court of Inquisition was formed in Toulouse in 1229, and Pope Gregory IX. in 1233 nominated two Dominican friars the inquisitors. The writer, therefore, was guilty of a gross injustice, in charging St. Ignatius with a supposed crime, committed at least 155 years before he was born. So much for historical accuracy. However, we will indeed be miserably disappointed if we look for anything like knowledge of history amongst the swarms of self-sufficient, ignorant assailants of the Roman Catholic religion. All their objections are derived from two sources—the misrepresentations of their predecessors, and their own empty pride. They charge the Catholic religion with all the crimes which bad men have ever committed, and with several crimes which were never committed. They shut their eyes to their own crimes, and they reject the doctrines of the Catholic religion, because there is no demonstration of their truth from nature; and still they believe that grass grows, and they can discover no demonstration of the truth from its nature. They believe that corn seed will produce new corn, though they have no demonstration of the truth from its nature; and thus they mistake the evidence of the fact for the evidence of the nature. The Catholic offers them evidence of the fact that God revealed the doctrines of his church, and they require of the Catholic evidence of the truth of the doctrines from their nature, or they will not receive the evidence of the revelation. To argue with persons whose conduct is thus inconsistent and irrational, is folly.

Gregory XV. came to the papal chair in 1621, and St. Ignatius died in 1566, which was full fifty-five years before. He could not, therefore, have been the patron of Ignatius.

John Huss was burned on the 6th of July, 1415. Jerome of Prague, suffered on the 2d of June, 1415. Martin V. was elected Pope on the 11th of November, 1417. They could not therefore have suffered under

the pontificate of Martin V. We shall presently find that no Pope burned either of them.

Now let us examine the facts of the allegation. Pelagius is represented as ordering to have heretics and schismatics put to death. "Ordained that heretics and schismatics should be punished with temporal death." The very assertion is ridiculous, for the Pope had then no temporal power, and could make no such regulation or ordinance. The fact is, that having been consulted whether it was lawful to suppress by the secular power, those persons who would neither be convinced by reasoning, nor submit to authority, he answered that it was lawful for the secular power to do so if thought proper. And we have no hesitation in saying, that if persons under the pretext of religion should disturb the public peace, as many of the heretics and schismatics of that period did, it would not only be lawful, but it would be the duty of the temporal power to suppress their tumults, to preserve the peace. The Catholic Church teaches no more than this: and the principles of the American constitutions and of civilized society, teach the same doctrine. If the decree of Pelagius be construed thus, which is to us evidently its meaning, the doctrine is that of reason and not of persecution; but if it be construed to mean that persons may be put to death under the pretext of being heretics, or because they are heretics or schismatics, or infidels, it is a doctrine which the Catholic Church does not require her children to believe, but which many of those who are most attached to her faith, amongst whom we are proud to rank ourselves, believe to be contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, and of humanity, and unreasonable and impious. We know of no power given by God to governments in church or state to inflict bodily pain upon man for errors in faith; and hence we condemn all those acts of persecution and cruelty which have been committed upon our fellow-beings, whether by kings, emperors, popes, bishops, priests, sheriffs, reformers, warriors, or any others, as much as the man in Washington does, and still we are most tenacious Roman Catholics; and we believe each and every doctrine taught by the Roman Catholic Church, and reject every doctrine contrary to her principles; and we believe that no man ought to be persecuted for error in faith, and we reject the doctrine of persecution; and we do not know a persecuting tenet in the Roman Catholic code, though there have been persecutors in the church.

As for the miserably defective application of the text, "Judge not," and so forth, we too know that the Saviour tells us not to pass judgment upon the private failings of our brethren; and we also know that the same Scripture informs us that, speaking of doctrine in the first

council held in Jerusalem, the phrase used by the Apostles was, "I judge." And if the writer himself went to law for his property, with an unjust aggressor, he would condemn as inefficient or unprincipled the judge, who, under the affectation of complying with the Redeemer's injunction, would not enter judgment. Neither would he be safe in his person or property, were there not judges who would condemn men in judgment. We feel ashamed at being obliged to expose such a silly misapplication of Scripture.

His next case we have already answered. Martin V. did not burn John Huss nor Jerome of Prague. It is true they were burned, but not by the Pope, nor by the church, but by the laws of the empire, and not by any ecclesiastical law.

Gregory XIII. did not contrive the murder of the Protestants at Paris. The story of the unprincipled massacre at St. Bartholomew's, in 1572, is a long and a melancholy history. Much has been written to extenuate, nothing could justify so atrocious and disastrous accumulation of perfidy and murder. We now only examine the share which Gregory had in it. We have looked into several authors, and frequently examined, to try if we could find any circumstance to connect the Pope with this act of Charles IX. and the queen mother and the Duke of Guise; and we have been always more convinced by our inquiry, that the few writers who attempted to charge Gregory with any share in the transaction were slanderers.

In the first place, Gregory was raised to the pontificate only on the 13th of May, 1572, and the massacre commenced on the 23d of August. Thus it would be extraordinary, if entering upon the discharge of very complicated duties, his first would be to plot this horrid butchery, when he had much to look to at home.

Secondly. Many others tell us, that, although the catastrophe did not take place until 1572, that it was planned at a meeting held at Blois in 1570, just after the marriage of Charles IX.; of course, this was nearly two years before Gregory's accession to the pontificate.

Thirdly. The character of Gregory is that of a good, tenderhearted, pious man; and surely a person possessed of those qualities would be incapable of being a party to such a crime.

Fourthly. We have not a particle of evidence to connect him with it; and upon the principle that a man is to be believed innocent until he shall have been proved guilty, we ought to acquit him.

Fifthly. When we look to the unhappy state of France, and the dispositions of the queen mother and the Duke of Guise, we shall find they wanted no incitement.

The only circumstance which has been adduced to inculpate the Pope, is, that after the massacre he had public processions in Rome, for the purpose of thanksgiving. No doubt but if Gregory then viewed the transaction as we do now, he would deserve equal obloquy for this unbecoming exhibition, as if he had been a plotter or an executioner of the carnage. But was he then aware of the facts? By no means. The perpetrators of the massacre did not publish their crime to the world in all its horrors. They sought to justify their conduct. France had previously been embittered and desolated by a civil war of the worst description, her finest provinces laid waste, numbers of her clergy butchered, her churches plundered and destroyed, an attempt made to seize upon her monarch, and England busily engaged in exciting the Calvinists, who were the authors of all those evils, to still greater exertions. The Catholic murderers of Paris and the provinces were, in many instances, persuaded that the Calvinists had entered into a conspiracy to destroy them, and though we have reason to believe the prime movers of the mischief knew that there was no such conspiracy, yet they propagated the report, and endeavoured to give the whole transaction the appearance of having been only the necessary vengeance which self-preservation demanded from a people who were unsuspectingly upon the verge of destruction.

In this light was the whole transaction represented at Rome, and the Pope did institute a public thanksgiving for the preservation of the Catholic religion from the destruction to which he was told it was exposed in France. Thus, upon a fair examination of the facts, we discover that Pope Gregory XIII. had no connexion with the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve, in Paris; and that the misrepresentation of the object of his thanksgiving, forms the only equivocal circumstance in his whole case; and the testimony of all history proves that the colouring which was given to the transaction was well calculated to deceive the Pontiff. There are many liberal and well-informed persons, who, even at this day, contend that the massacre was in truth but a preventive measure by the Catholics, and that what we call a deceitful gloss, was but the true colouring. The king, Charles IX., in his letter to the Pope, calls it a punishment of conspirators against him and the Catholic princes. However, our opinion is, that the Catholics did not receive any immediate provocation, and that the massacre of the Calvinists was wickedly planned and cruelly executed; but that massacre is no part of the Catholic religion, nor had the Pope any concern in it.

Gregory XV. is by all writers, Catholic and Protestant, acknowledged to have been one of the mildest of men, and of all others least

deserving the name of persecutor. How the writer has selected him as one fit to be placed on the list we know not, except that, by copying the blunders of others, he has endeavoured to swell his list. It is a little extraordinary, that those writers who ransack every corner to discover the peccadilloes of Popes, can find nothing against the good men John Knox, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, who caused more carnage, devastation, and religious persecution, than all the popes, bishops, kings, emperors, and inquisitions of the Catholic Church, during eighteen centures, and whose followers and adherents are at this day the only persecutors that we know of in Europe, with the exception of the Turks.

We must endeavour to bring this subject to a close, and for that purpose will examine the remaining specifications of the charges against the Roman Catholic Church.

"Innocentius the Third, brought in the doctrine of transubstantiation, ordered a pix to cover the host, and a bell to be rung before it, and first imposed auricular confession on the people. He died in 1216. This forms the era when priests gained complete power over the consciences of men."—*Washington Gazette*, July 20.

The first charge here is, that Innocent III. introduced the doctrine of transubstantiation. Of all the historical blunders of which any writer was ever guilty, this is one of the greatest and most glaring. About 350 years after the period here assigned, the compilers of the *Book of Homilies* in England, inform us that all Christendom had been in a state of damnable idolatry during more than eight hundred years; and as one of the grounds of this charge is said to be the doctrine of transubstantiation, that doctrine must have been in Christendom at least five hundred years before the death of Innocent III. How then could he have introduced a doctrine which existed 460 years before his existence? Luther testifies that it was in the church during ages before—so does Calvin, so does Zuinglius, so do all the early fathers of what is called the Reformation. And now, for the first time, an obscure ignorant writer, who has been convicted by us of nearly one hundred blunders, errors, and misrepresentations, in an article of about two columns in length, asserts that Innocent III. had introduced it!!! Berengarius, the Archdeacon of Angers, in France, was, sixty years before, the only individual who was found to dissent therefrom; and after all the researches that could have been made by the impugners of the doctrine, Berengarius, John Scotus Erigena, and Ratramnus, if such a being ever existed, are all the writers or authors whom they can produce as raising a question upon the subject during 1500 years. The doctrine is found in the writings of most of the fathers, especially in those of St. Augustine, eight hundred years before the time of Innocent III., in those of St.

Ambrose, who was his master; still earlier in those of St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Irenæus, and in the holy gospels. Never have we met a more unfounded assertion more unblushingly made. It is folly to argue with men who can so unhesitatingly print such palpable untruths.

He "ordered a pix to cover the host." We do not know the meaning of the expression, and therefore cannot say anything of its truth or falsehood. A *pixis* is the small vessel used for keeping the holy sacrament of the eucharist; and from the earliest ages the sacrament was kept sometimes in a fine linen cloth, sometimes in a vessel, which was at different times of different materials. The question of doctrine is not, in what vessel was the sacrament preserved, but what was it believed to be.

He "ordered a bell to be rung before it." Bells were not in general use before this period; but previous to the time of Innocent III. bells were in many places rang at the consecration of the eucharist, and upon carrying it to the sick, or in procession; but at this period bells coming into general use, the custom became more general, and the order was made. This surely was no crime. The crime imputed is the belief of transubstantiation, and not the ringing of the bells.

He "first imposed auricular confession upon the people." This is no new calumny. It is at least three hundred years old, and has been three hundred thousand times refuted. Yet it is still repeated, with as little sense of shame as if it were true.

The Council of Lateran held in 1215 under this Pope, made a canon; it was the act of the Council, and not an act merely of the Pope; which canon subjected to spiritual censures at least in the year. Now there is a great difference between commanding a person to perform, at a particular time, a duty which had been previously obligatory, and introducing a new duty to be performed. Confession was obligatory before; but Christians were so fervent and regular that there was originally no need of compelling them to discharge their duties; they were themselves anxious for their discharge; but growing negligent, it became necessary to threaten punishment should the negligence continue, and to prescribe a time when the duty should be performed.

Confession was obligatory before. Should we show this by the testimony of any one author who lived and wrote before the year 1215, it would prove that it was not in that year it was introduced. St. Bernard, one hundred years before, speaks of it as Roman Catholics do at this day. He calls it a part of the sacrament of penance, and he states that priests are not to give absolution except to those who are contrite and have confessed. Peter Damianus, a respectable writer, one hundred

years before St. Bernard, writes on the necessity of confessing all the sins, and the sacrilege of concealing any, and of the obligation of the priest to profound silence. A century earlier, Radulph, another eminent writer, gives us the same doctrine. In the ninth century, Rabanus, Bishop of Mayence, writes on the necessity of confession and penance for the remission of sins. In the eighth age the venerable Bede describes the distinction between mortal and venial sin, and the mode, and the necessity, and the benefit of confession, in his commentary upon the 5th chapter of St. James. In the seventh age, Cesarius, Bishop of Arles, has several homilies on penance; in the tenth he entreats sinners to go for safety to confession. In the preceding age, St. Gregory the Great, and St. John Climacus and several others, testify the existence and the necessity of the custom. In the previous ages we have the testimony of Sozomen, St. Leo, St. Augustine, St. Innocent I., St. Jerome, St. John Chrysostom, St. Athanasius, Ambrose, Hilary, Basil, and Cyprian, of Tertullian and Origen, of the Councils of Worms, Tours, Constantinople, Carthage, and Laodicea, of the Apostle St. James, and of the Acts of the Apostles. What then must be thought of the assertion of the individual, who in opposition to an host of testimony, of which the names of one-fifth of the witnesses are not here enumerated, calmly asserts that it was Pope Innocent III., who in the year 1215 introduced auricular confession, when in fact it was introduced by Almighty God 2700 years before, as may be seen in the books of *Numbers* and *Leviticus*, fifth chapter of each.

So that if the period of the introduction of auricular confession forms that era when priests gained the full power over the consciences of men, we must fix that era at a very early period.

The last charge which this writer brings regards indulgences.

"Clement the Fifth first made indulgences and pardons saleable. A very pretty kind of merchandise for the head of the church to deal in. He died in 1315."

"Leo the Tenth increased the sale of indulgences and pardons to an unlimited degree: burnt Luther's books, declared him and his followers heretics. Died in 1522."—*Washington Gazette* of July 20.

"And did not Clement the Fifth introduce the sale of indulgences and pardons into the church? And did not Leo the Tenth extend that kind of traffic, so that indulgences and pardons were hawked about all Christian countries, like as our Yankees do their notions—for one might not only have purchased a pardon for all sins committed, but all that were to be committed? This, indeed, was the chief cause of the Reformation, and was the chief argument used by Luther to effect that purpose. To deny this is to call all history false."—*Same paper*, of Aug. 20.

Now, without calling all history false, we do distinctly deny the whole of his assertions concerning indulgences, and we declare they do not contain the truth.

We acknowledge that bad men did, at different times, abuse the doctrine of indulgences, by endeavouring to impose upon the faithful, in promising effects from indulgences which the church never promised. We also acknowledge that several abuses of the power did frequently take place, but the church uniformly condemned the impostors, and laboured to suppress the abuses. She, then, is not accountable for the misconduct of those whom she condemns, more than any state in this Union is accountable for the frauds of the villains who may be found amongst its citizens. Nor is she answerable for the abuses which she has endeavoured to suppress, as the state is not answerable for the pettifogging chicanery and fraud which is committed under the semblance of law, but which is in direct opposition to the spirit of the law, though covered by the letter.

It is true that some bad men did at times go about hawking indulgences; but we do not, on that account, think that a native of England, who has been kindly received into this country, honoured with citizenship, and pampered in a public office under the federal government, is authorized to insult a portion, and that a large and respectable portion of the citizens of the oldest states in the Union, with his bad English and his petulant abuse, "hawked about indulgences like as our Yankees do their notions." The writer should have made a better return for the kindness shown to an adventuring stranger, who came to this country unsent for, to seek his bread.

Indulgences and pardon of sins are not the same thing. How often has this been stated? Hundreds of millions of times. Yet still the unblushing, obstinate adherence to misrepresentation, which possesses our adversaries, will not be given up. In other cases we are ready to say a man might have made a mistake. We are ready to make allowance for error. But here we are told your indulgence is leave to commit sin. We answer, no, you mistake; sin is pardoned only by repentance before God. But after sin is forgiven by the mercy of God, and through the merits of Jesus Christ, a temporal punishment remains due in place of the eternal punishment, which the mercy of God has remitted; and an indulgence is the remission or mitigation of this temporal punishment, through the mercy of God and the merits of redemption. Thus there are two remissions, the first of sin, the second of temporal punishment; the second is the indulgence, and this second cannot be obtained until after the first has been accomplished by repentance and the application of the merits of the death of Christ to the soul of the sinner. Thus, an indulgence is neither pardon of a sin which has been committed, nor leave to commit a sin in the time to come. This explanation has been

repeated over and over again. Yet a man who has heard this explanation tells us, "By an indulgence you might have purchased a pardon for all sins committed, and all that were to be committed." Can any stretch of charity warrant our saying, with truth, "This is only a mistake; he thinks so?" It is impossible any person who has seen or heard the explanation could think so. The assertion, then, is not the evidence of ignorance, but of a far worse quality.

As to the sale of indulgences, we allow and admit freely that bad men have committed abuses. But there is what we will admit to be a mistake upon the minds of many persons as to this practice. A sale means the giving of one commodity for another. Now, money or other commodities may frequently be given with particular dispositions, not to purchase spiritual effects, which no money could purchase, but to please the Lord, and yet a spiritual advantage will be obtained. Thus, when the Scripture informs us that "alms-deeds release from sin," we do not believe the money purchases the pardon of the sin in the sense ordinarily attached to sale and purchase. Thus, when the prophet Daniel tells the king, "Redeem thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities with works of mercy to the poor, and perhaps God will forgive thy offences," we do not understand a purchase and a sale. Thus, when Christian preachers exhort their flocks to alms-deeds, and assure them that "he who giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord, and that the Lord will repay him," we do not accuse them of selling pardon. So with indulgences, when the church tells us, that by alms-deeds we may obtain the mercy of Christ, to remit even the temporal punishment to which we remain liable, after we have by repentance and mercy obtained pardon of our sins, it is not a sale and purchase; it is but the application of the same principle which pervades the new law and the old.

But as alms-deeds are not the only mode pointed out in the Scripture for the obtaining pardon of sins, so they are not the only mode pointed out for the obtaining of indulgences. Prayer, visiting the sick, instructing the ignorant, receiving the sacraments, and such like practices of piety, are equally as alms-deeds the condition of indulgences. Thus the doctrine is grossly misrepresented by this writer.

In his history he is equally unfortunate.

He says that Clement V., who died in 1315, first introduced the sale of indulgences, that is, granted them in consideration of alms-deeds. We shall quote but one fact out of ten thousand which may be adduced to refute this assertion. Burchard, who wrote on indulgences a century before that period, mentions several instances. Amongst them is the 56th canon of the Council of Triburia, held in the year 895, in a royal

residence of King Arnulph, near Mayence, at which were present twenty-two bishops, amongst whom were Hatton, Archbishop of Mayence, Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, and Rathodus, Archbishop of Treves: and in this the custom of granting an indulgence in consideration of alms-deeds, is mentioned as a well-known fact from all antiquity. The same Burchard quotes a very old Roman Penitentiary, which was at least as ancient as seven hundred years before the time of Clement V., which states that a penance of fasting one day on bread and water, which was enjoined in many cases by the penitential canons, might, by an indulgence, be commuted to reading fifty psalms on the knees, and giving as much alms to a poor person as would support him for a day, or giving an equivalent towards building or decorating a church; and this penance would be incurred for much less lying or misrepresentation than is now committed with impunity, because it was then considered to be a great crime to violate the command of God, which says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

We shall take our leave of the writer in Washington in our next. He has given us some employment, but we do not regret it.

THE WRITER IN WASHINGTON.

We have gone through his facts, or rather his fictions. We did intend to devote two or three columns to remarks, but we have not the opportunity. We bid him farewell, with the advice, given in the spirit of friendship, to study history before he takes up his pen again. Of him indeed it might be truly said,

His rage
Outweigh'd his brain,
But half a grain.

BENEDICTI[illegible]UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
237.032E56 C001 V003
THE WORKS OF THE [illegible]HT REVEREND JOHN ENG
3 2811 00007 6382